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Abstract

What is the meaning of the term *gēr* within the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS)? The Qumran movement, with its heightened levels of purity and social closure, has been commonly considered closed toward not only non-Judeans, but also toward other Judeans. Such a view is taken despite the fact that within the context of the ancient Mediterranean, ethnic identity comprised multiple features, and an individual’s decision to make a change to these features generally permitted a change in ethnic groups (a conversion). These features that could demonstrate mutability included kinship ties and common culture, among others. How far reaching was this notion of conversion by means of mutable ethnicity? The *gēr* has served as an indicator within scriptural tradition of a sociohistorical shift in meaning from “resident alien” to Judean “convert.” And, notably, the term appears within the DSS. A study of the term *gēr* as it is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, contrasted against majority scriptural predecessors, reveals various important features of ethnic identity pertaining to members of the Qumran movement. Where this sectarian movement is concerned, the features of shared kinship and a connection to land are significant. Furthermore, the practice of circumcision is understood as a third feature that represents the movement’s ethnic identity. A comparison to Greco-Roman associations confirms the language of “brother” to represent shared kinship in the case of socially-constructed groups whose identity comprises
ethnic features. Overall, the gēr is found to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism; however, these features of ethnicity do not always prove to be mutable and thus the gēr is included or excluded accordingly. These differences are noted between the Damascus (D) and Serek (S) traditions of the Qumran movement. The gēr as a Gentile convert to Judaism is included within the D tradition. This same convert to Judaism, however, is excluded from the S tradition. Members of that tradition believe that they themselves have converted to a supra-Judean ethnicity, by means of a circumcision of the heart.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The present thesis, at its core, asks one question: what is the meaning of gēr when the term is employed within the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS)? Gēr is a scriptural term that has served as a proven indicator to denote a sociohistorical shift from “resident alien” to a later meaning of “Gentile convert to Judaism.” No other term has done this. For example, immigrants into Judah after the collapse of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C.E. may serve as the sociohistorical context for the gēr as a resident alien for whom harvest gleanings should be left in the fields (e.g. Deut 24:19-21). In the first centuries C.E. where Judean conversions are well-documented,¹ the gēr of rabbinic literature takes on a meaning of one of these Gentile converts to Judaism. This meaning is evidenced by the term’s expansion to that of a “righteous gēr” (the religious convert) which now contrasts against that of a “gēr tôshab” (representing the prior “resident alien”). But within the context of the DSS and the Qumran movement affiliated with them,² the meaning of the term is uncertain. Currently there is no

¹Narratives understood as “conversions” occur in a variety of Judean texts, such as those described by Philo in Spec. Laws 1.51 and 1.309-309; and Josephus, Ant. 13.257-258; 13.318-319; 20.139; and 20.145.
²The present study defines those groups affiliated with Qumran as the “Qumran movement,” to acknowledge the Qumran movement does not consist of only one, uniform point of view, nor even one, uniform, locale. See the brief introduction to the sectarian nature of the Qumran movement in section 1.1.1 of the present chapter, in addition to the brief overview of the Damascus and Serek traditions included within Ch. 2 of the present project, sections 2.1-2.1.4. The term “Qumran movement” already finds parlance within scholarship, for example, in the work of Jutta Jokiranta. Concerning the term, she writes: “the term ‘Qumran movement’ refers to the movement responsible for composing, copying, and preserving the Dead Sea Scrolls, irrespective of whether this movement or parts of it were located at Khirbet Qumran. When we think of Qumran sectarianism, it matters whether we think of a small, unique, central community, or rather a network of parallel communities, or something else (e.g. chronologically subsequent communities; contemporary conflicting communities).” Jutta Jokiranta, “Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism,” in Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 205, n. 2. To this definition, the present project would add one further caveat, which is that it is not certain to what degree every manuscript preserved at Qumran may correlate with this sectarian movement. For example, Aramaic texts make up roughly thirteen percent of the manuscripts found at Qumran, but are suggested to be distinct within the full DSS corpus; how representational they are of the Qumran movement is uncertain. See, for example, Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” in Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez (ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert
consensus on the *gēr*’s identity within this body of writings, appearing on thirteen occasions within texts that utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting: a variety of meanings have been posited for the *gēr*, including a non-Judean slave, a Judean who is halfway initiated into the Qumran movement, or a Gentile convert who is only included in a hypothetical era. Because the scrolls denote a level of social closure toward not only non-Judeans, but oftentimes also toward other Judeans, scholars most frequently conclude that a definition of a *gēr* as a Gentile convert to Judaism, as in the *gēr* of rabbinics, is unlikely. The socially closed nature of the Qumran movement has been interpreted to suggest that a former Gentile’s inclusion would be denied.

Why would a socially closed movement include a *gēr* within the community, as certain texts seem to suggest, if this figure represents a “resident alien” Gentile? At some point between the postexilic period and the first centuries C.E., the term *gēr* does change to include the new and widely understood meaning of “Gentile convert to Judaism,” and the present study aims to determine whether the nature of the *gēr* in the late Second Temple period writings of the DSS suggests such a change. Furthermore, what is “converting,” in a potential shift in meaning for the *gēr* from “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism” within the context of the DSS? What circumstances would permit or deny the inclusion of a former

---

Tigchelaar; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 197–205. (As it happens, no *gēr* is found in these Aramaic texts.) The possible wider affiliations within the DSS corpus as a whole is the reason for which the present study verifies a connection to the Qumran movement, and more specifically to the D or S traditions, of each text that employs the *gēr*, as evidenced within Chapter 2.

3The term *gēr* appearing in scriptural rewriting in the DSS could signal a change in meaning for the term, just as was seen above in other forms of scriptural rewriting. The study excludes occasions of the *gēr* occurring in scrolls which closely mirror majority scripture (meaning scripture which will become the Masoretic Text). Apart from these two general categories mentioned, no other occasions of the term exist in the DSS, such as in cryptic documents, calendars, or business dealings, to the present author’s knowledge. See the present chapter, Section 1.3, for specifics on the present study’s methodology and terminology. For the particular perspectives of the meaning of the *gēr* listed above, see, respectively, the works of John Lübbe, “The Exclusion of the *Ger* from the Future Temple,” in Mogilany 1993: *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann* (ed. Zdzisław J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanesia 13; Kraków: The Enigma Press, 1996), 175–82; Philip R. Davies, “The ‘Damascus Sect’ and Judaism,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 70–84; Terence Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007). See also the present chapter sections 1.2.1-1.2.1.8 for summaries of these scholars and others on the matter of the *gēr* in the DSS.
Unlocking the mystery of the *gēr*, as found within the context of the DSS, will also shed light on the ongoing debate concerning the nature of the Qumran movement itself, and can subsequently broaden scholarship’s understanding of not only other late Second Temple Judean groups, but also other groups within this Hellenistic time frame.

The ancient Mediterranean emphasized group orientation. And, if one considers a conversion, most broadly, as a permitted change in “groups,” then one finds evidence of various features “converting” and being made mutable to something different when considering the wider scope of groups within later Second Temple Judaism and the Greco-Roman world. For example, Roman citizenship was granted to foreigners who made contributions to Rome. Groups and individuals could become Hellenes if they relinquished their “barbarian” language and took up Greek. Judeans who wanted to take part in the Greek custom of the gymnasium hid their circumcisions. All of these examples demonstrate a conversion of sorts and permitted mutability of various features, including those features observed above of citizenship, language, and practices of common culture. These features are examples overall of what one could regard in this Mediterranean world as “ethnic communities”: groups with features of sameness, including in most general terms both features of kinship and culture, that can be defined against, and unlike, other groups with

---

4Philip Esler writes the following: “The various cultures of the ancient Mediterranean region were strongly group oriented. The family was the most important group, and ties of kinship were the strongest social ties of all. Yet other groups also carried weight.” Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 54.
6Rebecca F. Kennedy, C. Sydnor Roy, and Max L. Goldman, select and trans, *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation* (Indianapolis; Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2013), 67, drawing on Herodotus’ *Hist.* 1.56.2-57.3. Kennedy offers the following annotation for this passage: “Herodotus addresses the idea of language as an identifier of race and ethnicity. One can be born as part of one group, but can become part of another through the adoption of a new language.”
features of kinship and culture. Therefore, a “conversion” consists of a change in features that enables a change in membership between ethnic communities (those communities exhibiting features of kinship and culture). In other words, ethnicity comprises mutable features in this Hellenistic and Judean milieu.

Based on the above examples, certain features pertaining to kinship and culture do seem to be emphasized for each occasion of conversion. Following this logic, if the gēr is found to represent a “convert” within the DSS, then certain features of ethnicity may be mutable within the Qumran movement. Charting changes observed in the term gēr as it is employed within the DSS, just as has been done previously to observe sociohistorically influenced changes in meaning, and comparing these findings against other similar groups to check for the feasibility of sociohistorical observations, will in fact reveal mutable features of ethnicity within the Qumran movement. Simply put, while not intuitive based on the socially closed nature of the Qumran movement, the thesis argues that the gēr employed in texts that draw on the technique of scriptural rewriting in the DSS represents a convert, although variably included or excluded within the movement. A gēr-convert is a prior Gentile who converted to Judaism and is assumed to have undergone circumcision, and joined the movement affiliated with the Damascus tradition. However, this same Gentile convert to Judaism, represented in the gēr, is found to be excluded from the Qumran movement affiliated with the Serek tradition. Members of the Serek tradition believe that they themselves have become supra-Judean, having undergone a secondary circumcision “of the heart.” The nature of conversion or its denial is esteemed to involve a notion of mutable or immutable ethnicity,

---

9John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith write that the term *ethnos* and various derivatives within the Greco-Roman world refer to “other peoples who . . . belong to some group unlike one’s own.” They clarify that in their work that follows, the term “ethnic” is applied to all groups—not only the “other”—an application to which the present study follows suit. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, “Introduction,” in *Ethnicity* (ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4–5. See Section 1.2.2 of the present chapter for further explanation concerning the components of “ethnicity” in this Mediterranean milieu and more broadly within the scope of ethnicity studies.

10See Section 1.3 of the present chapter for descriptions of scriptural terms, including “scriptural rewriting.”
whereby features of a shared notion of kinship, connection to a land, and a common culture in the practice of circumcision, are critical components.

1.1 Context

1.1.1 Context Part I: “Sectarianism” and Levels of Social Closure within the Qumran Movement

Overall, scholarship’s notion of the Qumran movement as a sectarian one with low tolerance of outsiders is well-founded. Certainly one of the contested features of current Qumran scholarship is the idea of a particular type of “Qumran sectarianism,” based on, for example, the use of a solar calendar system.11 Nevertheless, on a basic sociological front, David Chalcraft argues that “it is still very worthwhile to think about the religious movements/social movements attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls in terms of sects and sectarianism.”12 Chalcraft’s own working definition of a sect is the following: “a social group whose claims to exclusivity have led to strict demarcations and discipline of membership, and whose operation of social

11As one example, in Carol Newsom’s foundational article in which she defines the nature of a Qumran sectarian text, her suggested criterion of “adherence to the solar calendar” may no longer be used as a sign of Qumran sectarianism. Helen Jacobus has demonstrated that it appears more likely that the Qumran movement maintained “different calendars” which were used for “different purposes.” For example, the theory that the Qumran movement solely utilized a solar calendar breaks down when one considers that 1QPesher Habakkuk, an established text of the Qumran movement with its frequent use of the term yahad (see Ch. 2 pp. 91-92 on this term) suggests possible use of a lunar calendar with reference to the day of Atonement in XI, 6-7. Carol Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters (ed. William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 177; Helen R. Jacobus, “Group Identities and Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” paper presentation (Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting; University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 23 July 2012). See also the published dissertation of Jacobus, expanding on the same topic, in which she proposes “that there was a multiplicity of shared calendars, rather than a plurality (that is, each group using only their own separate calendar), that there may have been a variety of common texts for different purposes shared by various groups in Second Temple Judaism over periods of time.” Helen R. Jacobus, Zodiac Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Reception (IJS; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), 452–53. Jacobus also suggests 4Q318 to be a “lunar zodiac calendar” which is a “Qumran calendar.” See Helen R. Jacobus, “4Q318: A Jewish Zodiac Calendar at Qumran?” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context (ed. Charlotte Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 365–95 (citation from 394).

closure utilises religious attributes of belief and practice.”

These general descriptors of demarcation and social closure are critical to a sectarian identity, and are common attributes within definitions of sectarianism as defined by those who have studied the phenomenon within late Second Temple Judaism, as well as the Qumran movement specifically. Within these studies on sectarianism attributed to either late Second Temple Judaism generally, or the Qumran movement specifically, the descriptors of demarcation and social closure have been described in various ways, for example, “boundary marking mechanisms,”14 “a particular and internal worldview,”15 “an alienative, expressive response to society,”16 and also “high tension with the greater society.”17

These descriptors of demarcations and social closure may especially be observed in the expansionist interpretation of Torah and legal halakah sustained within the Qumran movement. The purpose of this expansion is to maintain higher purity standards. Based on the literary evidence, Hannah Harrington describes the Qumran movement’s process by which it maintains this heightened level of purity as the following:

1) an effort to extend the holiness of the Temple to the whole Temple city and require a high level of purity for the ordinary city (the level which the


sectarians strove to maintain in the present era), 2) a stringent interpretation of Scripture which homogenized all ambiguous data of the Torah on purity issues to agree with the most demanding relevant text, and 3) an attitude toward community food which required ritual purification before eating.\(^\text{18}\)

This “ordinary” city with the heightened Temple-level purity described by Harrington can be observed in regulations concerning similar-minded prohibitions to enter the Temple city for three days after having had sexual relations (11QT\(^a\) XLV, 11-12), and prohibiting sexual intercourse within the Temple city (CD XII, 1-2). These prohibitions created an expansive notion of spatial purity, rendering a notion of social closure to outsiders understandable.

Francis Schmidt has also suggested an actualization of the notion of expansive spatial purity; he suggests that the expansion occurs within the hierarchical structure of the movement itself. Schmidt argues that where the “Community of the New Covenant” is concerned (his term for the Qumran movement), notions of purity and impurity are inseparable,\(^\text{19}\) since the areas to demarcate degrees of purity or impurity are transposed onto the very Community hierarchy and activities themselves. For example, according to Schmidt, women are a demarcation line of impurity based on their position within each Community institution.\(^\text{20}\) The Council of the Assembly described in 1QSa I, 25-27,\(^\text{21}\) as well as the Council of the Community described in 1QS VIII, 1-2,\(^\text{22}\) represent the highest level of purity, and consequently women do not appear in these gatherings. Purity zones are built into the Qumran movement’s very structure,\(^\text{23}\) bringing pure and impure together in a very physical manner. In Schmidt’s model, profanation prevention is solely reliant on maintaining the regulations concerning these hierarchies and structures, thus raising the stakes on keeping this

\(^{19}\)Francis Schmidt, *La Pensée du temple. De Jérusalem à Qoumrân: Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien* (Editions du seuil, 1994), 142. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
\(^{22}\)Schmidt, *La Pensée du temple*, 152.
purity expansive and controlled. These elevated standards of purity, which induce
demarcation and social closure, are indeed signs of sectarianism.

Qumran’s “operation of social closure” is not uniform, however: differences have been
noted between the two primary rule text traditions existing at Qumran, namely those traditions
of the Damascus Document (CD) and its various 4QD manuscripts (collectively known as
D),24 and the Rule of the Community (1QS, or Serek Ha-Yahad) and its related manuscripts
(collectively known as S).25 These differences between D and S exist as different degrees of
social closure, concerning which John Collins argues the following: “they should be seen as
complementary branches of a larger movement, one of which aspired to a higher degree of
holiness than the other.”26 Certainly, differences in regulations between the two rule
traditions suggest a stronger concern on the part of S to avoid profanation and impurity, by
managing a more closed and tightly orchestrated movement.27 For example, S adds a key
descriptive marker of shared possessions that is not present in D. 1QS V, 2 specifies that
members are to share “with Torah and property,” while 1QS VI, 17-22 offers specific
regulations regarding a graded system of integrating members’ possessions in conjunction

24 D signifies “the comprehensive term for CD plus the 4QD fragments.” John J. Collins, Beyond the Qumran
Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge, U. K.:
Eerdmans, 2010), 13. The present study will also refer more generally to the “(D)amascus tradition,” which
represents the texts related thematically to the D rule, included within the study.

25 An overview of the manuscripts containing versions of the Rule of the Community can be found in Sarianna
Metso, The Serekh Texts (CQS 9; London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 2–6. Not included within the scope
of the present study are the smaller Rule of the Congregation 1QSa and a number of other smaller more
fragmentary community rule texts, such as 4Q265 4QMiscellaneous Rules. Sarianna Metso lists this fragmentary
manuscript and a number of others that use “organizational terminology.” Sarianna Metso, “Problems in
Reconstructing the Organizational Chart of the Essenes,” DSD 16 (2009): 390. The present study will also refer
more generally to the “(S)erek tradition,” which represents the texts related thematically to the S rule, included
within the study.

26 Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 6.

27 It should be noted that alternative theories have been forwarded concerning the level of social closure between
the traditions of D and S. For example, Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta observe high tension deviant
behaviours in D that are not necessarily as obvious as the physical isolation observed in S. For example, CD
XIII, 15-17 gives over the parental role of marriage or divorce approval to the “Examiner.” Such acts of
supervision would exert control over group members and distance outsiders, acting as another type of social
closure. Wassen and Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension,” esp. 217–18, 223. As one additional example, Gudrun
Holtz has observed what she describes as “inclusivist tendencies” within S, such as 1QS VIII, 4-10 and IX, 3-6,
whereby one observes a desire to atone for the land, which Holtz interprets to mean “the nation as a whole.”
with their entrance process into the movement. D, on the other hand, makes references to multiple dwelling sites not noted in S. Reference is made to “the rule of the assembly (месте) of the towns in Israel (לעיר ישראל)” (CD XII, 19). In addition, on multiple occasions references are made to movement members living in camps (מחנות), as witnessed in the following, for example: “the rule for the assembly of 23 [the] camps” (CD XII, 22-23); “the assembly of the camps” (CD XIII, 20); and a discussion regarding “if they live (in) camps according to the rule of the land” (CD VII, 6). Furthermore, D makes numerous references to women and children. For example, CD V, 7-10 describes an emendation to a law concerning marriage prohibitions, and CD XIII, 16 makes reference to anyone who marries a woman. CD VII, 6-7 describes a regulation concerning those members living in camps who take wives and beget children. CD XIII, 17-18 regulates concerning children of divorced members. CD XVI, 10-12 describes a regulation regarding the oath of a woman. S (excluding 1QSa) is moot on the matter of women and children. Generally, S appears to trend toward a more closed community outlook than D, with the shared possessions and lack of references to multiple and public dwelling sites in S as well as no mention of the presence of women and children. These known differences in social closure may also produce differences in the meaning of the gēr, and should thus be taken into account.

------------------------------------


29 In the present study, המשכן is translated as “assembly” and not “settlement,” for the sake of consistency among various works.

1.1.2 Context Part II: *Gēr* Research within Scriptural Tradition

While the *gēr* as it is employed within the DSS has thus far been minimally studied, certainly the *gēr* within other scriptural traditions has been studied at length. These other studies demonstrate that the different meanings of the *gēr* indicate a sociohistorical marker of the era in which the text is situated.

The noun *gēr*, with the meaning of a male “resident alien,” is added as a new term into the Covenant Code (Exod 21-23, CC) and the Deuteronomic Laws of chs. 12-26 (DL), the former of which was composed some time prior to the latter’s composition in the seventh through to sixth centuries B.C.E. The most basic *gēr* resident alien of the CC becomes a part of the “tripartite” *persona miserae* of the widow, the orphan, and the resident alien of the DL, demonstrating that these persons, due to an absent family network, are included among those who are typically lacking in provisions. Scholarly literature has suggested all of the following concerning the background of this *gēr*: he is an indigenous inhabitant of Canaan who is living amidst those who now make up the forming identity of “Israel”; he is an Israelite uprooted from somewhere else, such as one who has immigrated into Judah after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.E., the capital of the northern kingdom of Israel; or, he is a

---

31 José Ramírez Kidd argues that “the noun *גר* designates a legal status and is, therefore, restricted to *men*.” The noun, as separate from the verbal form *גור*, is never found in the feminine form in this prerabbinical period. José Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity and Identity in Israel* (BZAW 283; Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1999), 24, 28.

32 There is no reference to such an equivalent in ancient Mesopotamian law codes. Christiana de Groot van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 34–36. See also Charles Fensham, “Widow, Orphan and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature,” *JNES* 21 (1962): 129–39. Concerning dating, generally scholarship considers the CC to precede and to be revised by the DL, the composition of which has most commonly been considered to take place in the southern kingdom during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E. This dating links Josiah’s reforms of 2 Kings 22-23 with the corresponding centralization laws of DL. The absence of identifying Jerusalem as “the place” in Deut 12:13-15 can be explained as a purposeful reworking of “in every place,” borrowed from Exod 20:24, with the intention of maintaining the authority of that earlier text. See Bernard Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

permanent resident yet one who cannot own land.\textsuperscript{34} In each case the notion of a “resident alien” is appropriate.

Laws concerning the resident alien \textit{gēr} within the Priestly material (parts of Leviticus and Exodus, and Numbers, represented as P) and the Holiness Legislation (Lev 17-26 and other material, represented as HL) offer further cultic and legal inclusion than the DL. Dating for these materials ranges anywhere within the preexilic, exilic, and Persian postexilic periods.\textsuperscript{35} These egalitarian cultic regulations between the \textit{gēr} and the \textit{ezrah} (native born) are solely for the purpose of legal equality.\textsuperscript{36} This new need for legal equality is due to the HL’s concern for the land to remain pure and holy.\textsuperscript{37} This reason is stipulated in Lev 18:26-28 as follows:

\begin{quote}
26 But you shall keep my statues and my ordinances and commit none of these abominations, either the \textit{ezrah} or the \textit{gēr} who resides among you 27 (for the inhabitants of the land, who were before you, committed all of these abominations, and the land became defiled); 28 otherwise the land will vomit you out for defiling it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item Moshe Weinfeld dates DL and P to be concurrently written during the monarchic period, but from divergent factions. Israel Knohl identifies a Priestly Torah, written between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C.E., with the latter part overlapping in the creation of a Holiness School text, written between 740-700 B.C.E. Jeffrey Stackert argues that the Holiness Legislation “collects and distills the several law collections (CC, DL, P) that precede it.” Stackert’s work suggests a late exilic or even postexilic date for the HL material. See the following, respectively: Moshe Weinfeld, \textit{The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel} (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), Ch. 5; Israel Knohl, \textit{The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), esp. Ch. 1 for an overview of the two “schools”; Jeffrey Stackert, \textit{Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation} (FAT 52; Tubingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 224–5.
\item Cohen, \textit{The Beginnings of Jewishness}, 120. See also Moshe Weinfeld, who argues that the material the present study qualifies as “HL,” demands of the \textit{gēr} “only those obligations affecting the sanctuary and purity of the congregation.” Weinfeld, \textit{The Place of the Law}, 92.
\item On the matter of the \textit{gēr}’s inclusion within legal regulations specifically for the sake of purity of the land, Rolf Rendtorff writes the following: “In some texts the \textit{gēr} is explicitly made co-responsible, together with the \textit{ezrah} or Israelite, for the purity of the land.” Rolf Rendtorff, “The \textit{Gēr} in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch,” in \textit{Ethnicity and the Bible} (ed. Mark G. Brett; Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 83.
\item Within the present study, Hebrew Bible translations are a combination of the NRSV and my own.
\end{footnotes}
If any of the people in the land, whether native born or gēr, do not follow purity regulations, the sanctuary and land will become defiled. Such an understanding is made evident when one compares Deut 14:21 with Lev 17:15-16. While Deut 14:21 regulates that gērîm and foreigners (sg., the nokrî) may eat animals that die of themselves but Israelites may not, Lev 17:15-16 is clear that both an ezrah and a gēr who happen to eat such an animal must bathe, or they will be committing a moral impurity. The gēr in P and HL is still a resident alien, albeit with the addition of legal and cultic equality. The addition is accredited to an exilic or postexilic context in which a rationale for exile must be accounted. Scholarship that believes that the gēr of P and HL represents a “convert” has been outweighed by that which suggests the gradual integration of common culture merely helped to pave the way for later conversions.  

It is understood that Gentile conversion, apart from absorption into the Israelite people by means of intermarriage such as that observed in Deut 21:10-14, did not happen in pre-Hellenistic Israel. Instead, such a process is understood to have taken effect within the context of Hellenistic influence, which is the context for the third and second centuries B.C.E.


40 Jacob Milgrom, “Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel,” JBL 101, no. 2 (1982): esp. 173 and 175. Neither does Milgrom consider this absorption of the woman an actual conversion. See also Milgrom, “The Alien,” 18. Here, Milgrom suggests that the only “conversion” taking place is that of following Israel’s God, and that there is no way to become “Israelite.” A woman’s absorption into the Israelite people through marriage to a Judean man could be constituted as a type of “conversion,” once within the Hellenistic period, according to Shaye Cohen. Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew,” HTR 82, no. 1 (1989): 25.
translation of the Torah into the Greek Septuagint.\footnote{For an overview of form and dating concerning the Septuagint and Old Greek translations, see Emanuel Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible} (Second Revised ed.; Minneapolis; Assen: Fortress Press; Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), 134–39. Only if the Book of Chronicles dates within the period of Hellenistic Judaism, then feasibly Sara Japhet’s argument that “Chronicles already uses the term [גֵר] in its later sense” may prove accurate (referring to 2 Chr 2:16 [Eng. 17]; 30:25). See Sara Japhet, \textit{The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought} (rev. ed.; BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt; Berlin; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1997), 346.} Scholarship has divided itself into two camps where the meaning of the гēr is concerned within the Septuagint, now represented variably as either a \textit{prosēlutos} or a \textit{paroikos}.\footnote{See, for example, de Groot van Houten, \textit{The Alien}, 180–81.} According to K. G. Kuhn: “The final development of “proselyte” as a tt. [title] to denote the Gentile who becomes a full Jew by circumcision irrespective of his national or social position did not take place in Palestine but in the Judaism of the Graeco-Roman \textit{diaspora}.\footnote{K. G. Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” in TDNT, vol. 6 (ed. Gerhard Friedrich; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 730.} Kuhn considers that the term to represent the гēr as a proselyte, a Gentile convert to Judaism, is the \textit{prosēlutos}, a new Greek word introduced into the Septuagint. Christiana de Groot has been another proponent of the theory that the \textit{prosēlutos} represents the proselyte.\footnote{Additionally, in the Septuagint the гēr is represented on one occasion as a ξένος (Job 31:32) and twice as γειωράς (Exod 12:19; Isa 14:1).}

More recently, Matthew Thiessen has argued against a meaning of “proselyte or convert to Israelite religion” where the \textit{prosēlutos} in the Septuagint is concerned.\footnote{Matthew Thiessen, “Revisiting the \textit{Προσήλυτος} in ‘the LXX’,” \textit{JBL} 132, no. 2 (2013): 333–50, citation from 333.} Instead, he concludes that often the term \textit{prosēlutos} is used synonymously with \textit{paroikos}, and is frequently used where it can only mean a “sojourner,” as in a resident alien, and not a proselyte. Thiessen’s argument critiques the foundational conclusion of W. C. Allen that a \textit{paroikos} represents a resident alien and a \textit{prosēlutos} represents a Gentile convert to Judaism.\footnote{The article under question is W. C. Allen, “On the Meaning of \textit{ΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟΣ} in the Septuagint,” \textit{Expositor} 4, no. 10 (1894): 264–75.} Thiessen instead argues that no single conclusion can be drawn with regard to the \textit{prosēlutos} in the Septuagint, since each book derives from a different translator, and that even the Pentateuch itself may not put forward one unified approach. Examples provided by Thiessen

\begin{enumerate}
\item[42] Additionally, in the Septuagint the гēr is represented on one occasion as a ξένος (Job 31:32) and twice as γειωράς (Exod 12:19; Isa 14:1).
\item[44] See, for example, de Groot van Houten, \textit{The Alien}, 180–81.
\end{enumerate}
such as Exod 23:9 and Deut 10:19, whereby Israelites are represented as *prosēlutoi* in Egypt, do indeed pose a problem to Allen’s conclusion.\(^{47}\) Israelites would certainly not consider themselves as “proselytes” in Egypt, for such a usage in this case would imply idolatrous Israelite conversion to the worship of Egyptian gods. Nevertheless, examples of the *gēr* represented as a *prosēlutos* in Exod 23:12; Deut 14:21; and 23:8, do in fact align with Allen’s (and subsequently Kuhn’s and de Groot’s) conclusions.

Thus at best Thiessen could only argue for Exodus and Deuteronomy the same as what he suggests for the *gēr* representations within Genesis, Leviticus, and Numbers, which is that results are “inconclusive.”\(^{48}\) The *gēr/prosēlutos* in the Pentateuch portion of the Septuagint seems in flux. Clearly some sort of mechanism is present for the term to represent a proselyte, as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, in later texts. For example, Matt 23:15; Acts 2:11; 6:5 and 13:43 all refer to *prosēlutos* either in the singular or plural, within contexts that signify Gentile converts to Judaism. Despite acknowledging that one cannot definitively argue a meaning of “proselyte” for every usage of *prosēlutos* within the Septuagint, this creation of a new term expressly designed to translate the *gēr* into another language indicates an evolution in the meaning of the *gēr* in light of Hellenistic influence both within and outside of Judea.\(^{49}\)

This evolution reaches its final form in which the *gēr* refers to a Gentile convert to Judaism, or Judean proselyte, within rabbinic writings of the early centuries C.E. The proselyte *gēr* within the context of rabbinics is variably described as having been circumcised, baptized, accepted as a Judean, and having offered sacrifice. This *gēr* which represents a proselyte can stand alone in a text, such as the proselyte who prays while offering the first

\(^{47}\)Thiessen, “Revisiting,” 342–3. With regard to Exod 22:20; 23:9; Lev 19:34; and Deut 10:19, in which Israelites are described as *prosēlutoi*, the counter-argument is made that “[b]ecause the term in the motivating clause had to be the same as the term in the prohibition in order for the motivating clause to make sense, the Israelites are described as προσηλυτος in Egypt in these four instances.” de Groot van Houten, *The Alien*, 181; see also Allen, “On the Meaning,” 271.

\(^{48}\)Thiessen, “Revisiting,” 344.

\(^{49}\)It should be noted that no occasion of *prosēlutos* or *paroikos* exists within the Greek manuscripts at Qumran. See Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (vol. 1, Part 2 of DSSC; in consultation with Emanuel Tov; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).
fruits tithe in the synagogue, described in *m. Bik.* 1:4. The term may also appear as part of several different compound terms, in particular the *gēr tsedek*, which refers to a “righteous proselyte.” The *gēr tsedek* has become Judean out of a true motivation to following YHWH and Torah. The *gēr*, or *gēr tsedek*, is considered an opposite to the *gēr tôshab*, which is the term used within rabbinics to represent the biblical “resident alien.” Other secondary terms are also used to describe both the proselyte (such as *gēr emet*, a “true proselyte” or a *gēr ben bērit*, a “proselyte child of the covenant”), and the resident alien (such as *gēr sha’ar*, a resident alien at the gate). It is only within this period, beyond the scope of the DSS, that the *gēr* may be differentiated to describe either a male (ג) or a female (גירתה) proselyte.

The above outline clearly shows a marked change in the term *gēr* from a resident alien to a Gentile convert (or proselyte) to Judaism, from the late Second Temple period and onward. For this reason scholarship has demonstrated a keen interest in the meaning of the *gēr* within these other contexts. This external evidence suggests that a study of the *gēr* in the DSS will also demonstrate this changed meaning for the term.

One might question the *gēr*’s unique status as an indicator that can signal a changing perspective toward outsiders, since it exists among other terms that describe outsiders of varying degrees. Other outsider terms include the *nokrî*, “who originally belong[s] under the guidance of another distinct legal system,” the *zār*, who is “excluded from the cult and from

---


51 Texual examples given for the female proselyte are *mYeb.* 6:5; 8:2; 11:2; *mKet.* 1:2, 4; 3:1, 2; 4:3; *mKid.* 4:7; *mB.K.* 5:4; *mEduy.* 5:6. Schürer, History of the Jewish people, 170, n. 78.

the religious community,”

and of course the Gentile gôy (pl. gôyim). However, none of these terms change in meaning over time as does the gēr. For example, the nokrî is still an outsider who belongs under another legal system, as evidenced in CD XI, 2, whereby a Qumran movement member should not send a foreigner (הָעַל הַנֶּבֶר) to do his business on the Sabbath (i.e., to do a task on the member’s behalf). Likewise, concerning the zār as someone excluded from the cult and community, 4QFlorilegium 4Q174 1, I, 5 legislates that strangers shall never again desolate the house of the LORD (לֹא יַשְׁמֹהוּ עֹד זָרִים). Certainly, the meaning of gôyim did shift from that of Gentile “nations” in postexilic texts (e.g. Isa 60:11) to that of non-Judean “individuals” by the time of Hellenistic Judaism (the meaning commonly used within the DSS as well, e.g. CD XI, 14-15; CD XII, 6, 9). Nevertheless, this shift in meaning from a non-Judean collective to non-Judean individuals is not the same as the drastic change evidenced above by the gēr from “outsider” to “insider” in scriptural tradition. The relatively static nature of these other terms to express various types of foreigners or outsiders also suggests that within creative scriptural rewriting in the DSS, just as within other scriptural tradition, the gēr may be the sole term to serve as an indicator to changes in perception toward outsiders, via a change in meaning.

1.2 Problem and Significance

1.2.1 Problem and Significance Part I: Who Is the Gēr in the DSS?

Even though scholarship has deduced two basic interpretations for the scriptural gēr, namely an earlier meaning of a “resident alien” and a later meaning of a “proselyte,” as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, no unified opinion exists concerning whether the gēr as found in the DSS represents either the former or the latter of these definitions, or even something different. The

reason for this hesitancy is primarily due to the socially closed nature of the Qumran movement, as observed above. The closed nature and higher purity standards of the movement leave scholars doubting that the movement would permit the inclusion of a Gentile convert to Judaism.

It must be noted, however, that the process of conversion within Judaism was known to include the ritual act of circumcision, which is identified in sources both outside and within the DSS. Josephus, for example, identifies multiple Gentile conversions to Judaism, which are formalized by means of circumcision: the Idumeans (Ant. 13.257-258) and the Itureans (Ant. 13.318-319), for the purpose of remaining in their land; Azizus (Ant. 20.139) and Polemo (Ant. 20.145), both for the purpose of marriage. Both Abraham’s circumcision and also a nonliteral “circumcision of the heart” are described in the DSS, suggesting awareness of the matter of conversions. In light of this shift in meaning of the term ḡēr, along with further literary evidence in this Hellenistic era of conversions via circumcision accounts, it would be highly unusual if the Qumran movement was unaware of the term’s new implications. Even though the Qumran movement as a whole generally displays elements of social closure, the scrolls’ use of the term ḡēr, and also references to circumcision, both allude to matters of conversion and invite further explanation.

It is for these reasons that the present study deems the ḡēr a curious and useful term to follow. What is a ḡēr doing in the DSS, within the time period in which feasibly the term could mean a Gentile convert to Judaism? This section outlines a number of current theories, which demonstrate both intrigue and uncertainty on the topic of the ḡēr in the DSS.

To date, no monograph and only a little over half a dozen articles exist in which scholars have closely compared occasions where the term ḡēr has been employed. An

55See below n. 105 regarding debate concerning the forced or voluntary nature of these conversions. Ultimately, whether the conversions were forced or voluntary, the fact that circumcision was involved indicates that this ritual act is understood as a cultural component of conversion.
overview of these articles will show mixed results but for one element that remains clear: even in cases where scholarship deems the term gēr within the scrolls to represent a convert as in the rabbinical sense of the term, only a few instances of the term are taken into consideration and the research is incomplete or inaccurate. Overall, no consensus exists for all thirteen occasions where the term gēr has been employed, indeed in part because no study exists whereby all occasions of the term in scriptural rewriting of the scrolls have been considered. All thirteen occasions are as follows: Damascus Document CD VI, 14 - VII, 1; CD XIV, 3-6 (with the gēr occurring twice, once in line 3 and once in line 6); 4QInstruction 4Q423 Frag. 5, 1-4; Temple Scroll 11QTa XL, 5-6; 4QText Mentioning Temple 4Q307 Frag. 1, 1-8; 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B, 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 1-9; 4Qnahum Pesher 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, II, 7-10; 4QOrdinances 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1-3; 4QFlorilegium 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-4; 4QFour Lots 4Q279 Frag. 5, 1-6; Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments 4Q498 Frag. 7; and Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back 4Q520, Frag. 45.

1.2.1.1 Philip Davies, 1994

Davies takes into particular consideration the gēr of CD XIV, 3-6, wherein this figure is both included among those listed within the assembly of all the camps, and is also inscribed within this list. Davies suggests that the gēr is “a proselyte to the sect, and thus one in the process of initiation into it, who does not yet have a full place in ‘Israel’ or ‘Aaron.’” However, in his view, this “proselyte” gēr is merely an existing Judean in process of initiation into the sect,

56 The section on TS in Chapter 3 will include one additional example of a gēr in absentia between the Deuteronomic scriptural predecessor and the scriptural rewriting of TS. The thirteen occasions of the gēr employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS remain the focus; this example is included for the purpose of further emphasizing that the gēr, when present in the text of TS, represents a Judean convert.

57 These occasions where the gēr is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS (excluding 4Q159) can be found within Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran (vol. 1, Part 1 of DSSC; in consultation with Emanuel Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 182. See the section on 4Q159 in Chapter 2 of the present study for an explanation regarding that passage’s exclusion from the Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance.

and not a Gentile. Davies concludes thus because he interprets the regulations to stipulate that the Jew and non-Jew boundary shall never be crossed. This boundary is implied, according to Davies, from regulations that command sectarians to keep away from Gentiles, such as CD XI, 14-15 which prohibits spending the Sabbath in close proximity to Gentiles (גויים). Davies concludes that this gēr enters the sect by voluntary admission, and “presumably passes through a stage prior to full membership.”

1.2.1.2 John Lübbe, 1996

Lübbe considers the gēr located within the texts 4QpNah 4Q169; TS 11QT; 4QFlor 4Q174; and the two occurrences located within CD, VI, 14-VII, 1 and XIV, 3-6. He concludes that the gēr is a “non-Jew of more permanent residence” who is a slave of the “sectarians,” and who has been religiously dedicated just like any other possession of a member joining the Qumran movement (equating the gēr with those servant-type figures in CD XI, 2 and CD XII, 10-11). Lübbe determines that the members affiliated with CD would have dedicated their possessions in the same fashion as what is described in 1QS, the Rule of the Community. This gēr would be excluded from the “future temple,” to which he thinks both TS and also 4Q174 refer. Lübbe compares the gēr of the DSS to other examples, such as Lev 19:34 and Deut 23:8, and determines that no ties of shared kinship exist between the gēr of the Pentateuchal

59Francis Schmidt in fact follows a similar idea as he considers the gērîm to be Judean (non-Gentile) converts in the process of entering the movement, who are the demarcation into impurity along with women. Schmidt concludes thus concerning the gērîm based on 1QS VI, 13, which stipulates that community members will come from Israel. Schmidt, La Pensée du temple, 145.

60Davies, “‘Damascus Sect’,” 74–5.

61Davies, “‘Damascus Sect’,” 75.

62John Lübbe, “The Exclusion of the Ger from the Future Temple,” in Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann (ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanesia 13; Kraków: The Enigma Press, 1996), 181–2. Hannah Harrington also follows Lübbe’s conclusion, concurring that gērîm are “slaves of Jews who have joined the community (cf. CD 11:2; 12:10-11).” She continues by stating the following: “On the one hand, they became part of the sect’s communal possessions when their masters joined the sect and must adhere to communal regulations; on the other hand, they cannot become full-fledged members because of their ethnic background.” Hannah K. Harrington, “Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran,” in Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen (ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez and Mladen Popović; STDJ; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 196–7.
passages and the Israelites among whom he dwells.\textsuperscript{63} In so suggesting, Lübbe reiterates the conclusion that the \textit{gēr} of the CC and DL represents a non-Judahite resident alien. Because he argues that one should keep to an “established meaning” for a term wherever possible,\textsuperscript{64} he concludes that it is unlikely that the \textit{gēr} of the DSS should have any implications of shared Judean kinship with those sectarians either.\textsuperscript{65}

1.2.1.3 Katell Berthelot, 1999

Berthelot determines that the \textit{gēr} of the texts of Qumran is neither accurately represented by the biblical notion of the “resident alien,” nor the later rabbinical model of the “proselyte.” Instead, she develops a category which she identifies as the “stranger associated with Israel.”\textsuperscript{66} This \textit{gēr} is something of a “socio-tribal” category of Israel along the lines of the Levites, especially where CD is concerned.\textsuperscript{67} The \textit{gēr} is only religiously integrated with Israel, in contrast to both someone born Judean or a stranger who has actually become a Jew.\textsuperscript{68} In so suggesting, Berthelot implies that a Judean’s nature has both elements of religious practice and also a shared notion of kinship. Berthelot provides exception for two cases that may suggest the \textit{gēr} to be a proselyte, namely \textit{4QFlor} 4Q174 and \textit{4QpNah} 4Q169. Even though one may regard the meaning of the \textit{gēr} of 4Q174 to represent a “proselyte,” as opposed to a “resident alien,” this Gentile convert to Judaism is nevertheless excluded from the group. Berthelot deduces that the \textit{gēr} of 4Q174 is only someone “claiming to have become Jewish.”\textsuperscript{69} Such an interpretation of conversion “fraudulence” explains why this \textit{gēr} of 4Q174 is indeed excluded from the eschatological Temple. In the case of 4Q169, while Berthelot is inclined to believe that this \textit{gēr} is attached (using the verb \textit{lōh}) in a “pure biblical style,” she agrees it is possible that this \textit{gēr} could also imply a “posing” proselyte, in similar fashion to the \textit{gēr} of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{63}Lübbe, “Exclusion of the \textit{Ger},” 176–8.
\item \textsuperscript{64}Lübbe, “Exclusion of the \textit{Ger},” 176.
\item \textsuperscript{65}Lübbe, “Exclusion of the \textit{Ger},” 179.
\item \textsuperscript{66}Katell Berthelot, “La notion de \textit{גר} dans les textes de Qumrân,” RevQ 19, no. 74 (Décembre 1999): 177. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
\item \textsuperscript{67}Berthelot, “La Notion de \textit{גֵר},” 192.
\item \textsuperscript{68}Berthelot, “La Notion de \textit{גֵר},” 214.
\item \textsuperscript{69}Berthelot, “La Notion de \textit{גֵר},” 212–3.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The gēr of 4Q169, while attached to “Israel,” is still rejected by the authors of that text. Thus, where Berthelot is concerned, the gēr of the DSS is never actually a true “proselyte” nor is he of shared kinship with the other members in the Qumran movement. Finally, Berthelot observes that the texts of Qumran omit any sort of conversion ritual for new members, especially that ritual of circumcision, which would typically represent a Gentile’s conversion to Judaism.

1.2.1.4 Joseph Baumgarten, 2000

Joseph Baumgarten takes into consideration the gēr of CD XIV, 4, 6; CD VI, 21; 4QpNah 4Q169 3-4, II, 9; 4QFlor Frag. 1, 1, 4; and TS 11QTa XL, 6. Baumgarten concludes that the gēr is truly a proselyte, in the same sense as the gēr of rabbinic literature. The status of the gēr is inferior to that of Israelites by birth, demonstrated in the gēr’s lower listing after other members (4Q169), and also in the gēr’s exclusion from (4Q174) or impediments on entrance into (11QTa) the Temple precincts. Baumgarten seems to take the view that Gentile converts may join directly into the Qumran movement, albeit with presumably “more protracted and demanding” instruction in Torah commandments.

1.2.1.5 David Hamidović, 2007

Hamidović argues that the gēr of “biblical” texts is “almost like” another “tribe,” in the same fashion as the Levites. This gēr can be identified as a tribe of Israel without actually being a native born Israelite. For Hamidović, where the gēr of the Qumran movement is concerned, he is not to be regarded in the same fashion as in biblical texts. Instead, only the parts that transpose into the “Essene context” are retained. For example, Hamidović observes

70 Berthelot, “La Notion de גֵּר,” 213.  
71 Berthelot, “La Notion de גֵּר,” 214.  
73 Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Proselytes,” 701.  
75 Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 279. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
reconstructions of TS 11QTa XL, 6, and also XXXIX, 5. In the first reconstruction, Y. Yadin proposes the incorporation of a gēr into the Temple as of the third generation, by linking XL, 6 to Deut 23:9 [Eng. 23:8]. That passage names the third generation admittance of Edomites and Egyptians into the assembly of YHWH. In the second reconstruction, that of XXXIX, 5, Hamidović notes E. Qimron’s proposal which incorporates a gēr into the assembly of Israel as of the fourth generation. This reconstruction relies loosely on Gen 15:16, and describes fourth generation descendants of Abraham returning to the land after a time away from Israel. Gen 15:13 describes these Israelites as gērîm while in a land that is not theirs. In contradiction to a notion that these proposed reconstructions of 11QTa imply a closer cultural integration of the gēr in TS than in the Hebrew Bible, Hamidović concludes that TS ultimately distances the traditional cultural integration between the gēr and the Israelite: i.e., the gēr is no longer in the company of an Israelite from the first generation of his installation in Israel within HB scriptural gēr occurrences. Instead, the gēr is relegated to fourth generation inclusion. Thus he views the Qumran movement as imagining a status for the gēr that “conciliates the biblical base and their politico-religious project.” And, while Hamidović admits that this new fourth generation status possibly sees the gēr existing within “Essene” groups that live in towns, it is unlikely one should ever perceive this gēr as a Gentile convert to Judaism. This conclusion is based on the fact that the Essenes are still within Israel, and Hamidović believes the gēr as a proselyte is only relevant in a context outside of Israel when the sanctity of the land is of little concern.

77 Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 276–77, citing Elisha Qimron, The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions (Beer Sheva; Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press; Israel Exploration Society, 1996), 56. The present study does not include this proposed occasion where the term gēr may be employed, since the study excludes all proposed reconstructions of gēr for which no concrete manuscript evidence exists (see Introduction p. 45).
78 Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 277–78.
79 Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 279.
1.2.1.6 Terence Donaldson, 2007

Berthelot argues that the *gēr* of *4QFlor* 4Q174 and possibly *4QpNah* 4Q169 could represent a figure who considered himself a “proselyte,” but who would not be deemed legitimate by the texts’ authors to be welcomed into the eschatological Temple. Terence Donaldson argues something in an opposite vein, pertaining to the five passages (and six *gēr* occasions) of CD VI, 21; CD XIV, 4-6; *4QpNah* 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, II, 7-9; *TS* 11QTa XL, 5-6; and *4QFlor* 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-7. He suggests that the *gēr* of these texts, save CD VI, 21 which he believes should be rendered as “resident alien,”^81^ might be considered as a Gentile convert to Judaism, but only as an idealized and hypothetical possibility: “*גֵר* should be translated as proselyte rather than as resident alien, but the proselytes who appear in the texts are probably to be understood as hypothetical figures rather than as real community members. It is unlikely that the community actually incorporated Gentile converts.”^82^ Thus, according to Berthelot and Donaldson, the Qumran movement would know that a concept of a Gentile convert existed and that certain Gentiles called themselves “Judeans,” but the Qumran movement itself did not legitimate such a concept.

In addition, Donaldson supposes that if the *gēr* is found in an identifiable reuse of a Pentateuchal *gēr* passage, then the term is presumed to take on the understood “resident alien” meaning of that earlier passage. Donaldson’s study of the *gēr* in CD VI, 14-21 highlights this perspective: “The association of *גֵר* with “widows” (*אָלָמוֹת*), “orphans” (*יִתְמָר*), “poor” (*עַדְנֵי*), and “needy” (*אֵלַוִּי*), is strongly reminiscent of Pentateuchal language.”^83^ The second half of this supposition is to consider the meaning of the *gēr* when found in an unborrowed fashion and is a new use of the term. This *gēr* is presumed to represent a proselyte, in a similar fashion to the manner in which the term is used in later rabbinic traditions. For example, with

---

^83^ Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 205. Donaldson also finds that the passage lacks any other external “indicator of conversion,” which furthermore contributes to his conclusion.
regard to 4Q174, Donaldson concludes that the authors “were not simply replicating biblical categories in an antiquarian sort of way but were using the term with the sense that it had acquired subsequently.”

1.2.1.7 Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, 2011

According to Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, the ḡēr is a “legal fiction,” representing a Gentile who will be excluded from Israel in an eschatological era. Where the ḡēr appears to be included as a Gentile convert to the movement, namely within CD; 4QFour Lots 4Q279; and 4QpNah 4Q169, in fact this appearance is merely an attempt on the part of the Qumran movement “to make sectarian halakah reflect scriptural law as completely as possible.”

Ultimately, a Gentile would never enter the sect, neither in the “contemporary” era nor in the eschatological future. Moynihan Gillihan deduces that the Qumran movement responds with this attitude of exclusion because of an innate anti-Gentile ideology, evident in passages such as 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 3-4; War Scroll 1QM I, 1; 1QSa Rule of the Congregation I, 1-5; I, 22b-27a; and possibly I, 25b-II, 3a. These passages imply that Gentiles will be purged in the eschatological era, either by citing that the ḡēr or various foreigners will be excluded, or by omitting any reference to the ḡēr. Nevertheless, according to Moynihan Gillihan, the ḡēr appears in certain Qumran movement texts, such as the ḡēr to be cared for in CD VI, 21, only because this figure appears in the Torah.

1.2.1.8 Jutta Jokiranta, 2014

Jutta Jokiranta endeavours to dispel the “unwarranted dichotomy between the ger and the proselyte” by avoiding from the outset the question regarding when the term ḡēr comes to

---

84 Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 212. Donaldson is referring to the fact that the ḡēr in 4Q174 does not appear in the scriptural texts that have been conflated (Deut 23:3-4 [Eng. 2-3] and Ezek 44:9) to create the rest of the list in which the ḡēr appears.
87 Moynihan Gillihan, “The ḡēr Who Wasn’t There,” 305.
represent a proselyte, and instead by looking for other conceptualizations. Jokiranta considers numerous conceptualizations of ġēr and conversion, and ultimately creates a new conceptualization, rather than of conversion, of “obligations/rights in activities and participation, identity, and loyalty.” Jokiranta considers the ġēr from those identified passages within TS 11QT; CD XIV; CD VI-VII; 4QFlor 4Q174; 4QOrd 4Q159; and 4QpNah 4Q169. With regard to the absence of the term “ġēr” from S, Jokiranta does not condone the theory that “the ġer was dissolved and fully assimilated, by ‘proselytism’, and treated similarly to other Judaean members.” However, Jokiranta concludes that “the ġer is a ‘full’ member but low in the internal hierarchy.” Thus, while avoiding the term “convert,” Jokiranta appears to consider the ġēr in a similar fashion to the present study as someone who has changed ethnic identity, through the lens of the above-noted obligations/rights in activities and participation, identity, and loyalty. And, for Jokiranta, the category of identity includes the components of “ethnic [kinship], religious, political, familial, local and other components.” With regard to 4QpNah 4Q169 in particular, Jokiranta argues that in this one text the ġēr is on the “side of the errant,” yet only goes so far as to say that the passage highlights that “no-one remains unaffected by the counsel of the misleaders.” In other words, it appears this ġēr may not be a member of the movement according to Jokiranta. This finding is different from that of Baumgarten, who yet considers the ġēr of 4Q169 to be a convert to the Qumran movement.

89 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 668.
90 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 676, see also 671–72.
91 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 675.
92 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 668.
93 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 675.
1.2.2 Problem and Significance Part II: of What Does Ethnicity and Conversion Consist?

The above review of scholarship and its overall posited impressions regarding the *gēr* of the DSS demonstrates inconclusive research on the topic. In part, the *gēr* is poorly understood because further clarity is also needed to grasp what would permit or deny an outsider’s acceptance as a member of any Judean group. In other words, what is the nature of the change entailed in a new member’s acceptance? In a conversion movement from “other” to “same,” what is the nature of this “sameness”?

Martin Goodman describes the beginning of Gentile conversions to Judaism in the following manner: “Precisely when and why Jews began to believe that gentiles who came to join them and took up their customs should be treated not just as tolerated strangers but as Jews in their own right is uncertain . . . There is much in favour of the hypothesis that this Jewish concept was adopted in response to the universalism of Hellenism.”

By “universalism” Goodman means that “anyone who wished to do so could become Greek by behaving in a Greek fashion,” which would entail choosing to follow Greek law. The parallel is that anyone who so chose could follow Judean (Torah) law. Thus, being “Israelite” or “Judean” was only something that one could choose to become after the influence of

---

Hellenism upon Judea and the Judean Diaspora.\textsuperscript{96} With the acceptance of the Greek polemic of a civilized society that followed a rule of law, as opposed to a barbaric society that did not,\textsuperscript{97} came the phenomenon described by Michael LeFebvre as “legislative uses for native law writings.”\textsuperscript{98} This phenomenon meant that for Judea, Torah became a legislative law code, as opposed to a law collection without legislative uses.\textsuperscript{99} In so doing, according to LeFebvre this new legislative Torah minimized and separated its connection to other Judean features of kinship and religious practice.\textsuperscript{100} This move in permitting “Torah” to become a mutable feature of an Israelite/Judean is believed to be the underlying factor that instigated and permitted Gentile conversions, in a similar fashion to those changes between groups permitted throughout the Greco-Roman world.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{96}On the topic of conversions as a matter of choice, John North describes the phenomenon, from the perspective of “religion” in the Mediterranean world, as the following: “one aspect of the major transformation of religious life in the whole Mediterranean area in this period was the establishment of a system of interacting competing religions between which the individual could, even in a sense had to, choose.” The present study will argue that “religion” (common culture) is only one feature that changes in a conversion, and furthermore that the Hellenistic desire to be civilized, as opposed to being “barbaric,” precipitated the first conversions for Judaism as early as the second century B.C.E. Nevertheless it is interesting to observe North’s discussion whereby he argues that early Christianity, as a missionary group, would have even further triggered other groups to compete to avoid having members choose to switch groups (i.e., convert) elsewhere. In other words, the phenomenon of conversions (and as shall be seen, mutable ethnicity) grows in strength throughout the Mediterranean over the full time period of the Qumran movement and beyond, and may find further motivating forces with time. See John North, “The Development of Religious Pluralism,” in \textit{The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire} (ed. Judith Lieu, John North, and Tessa Rajak; London: Routledge, 1994), citation p. 191.

\textsuperscript{97}One example of the importance of Greek law for Hellenism can be observed in Herodotus, \textit{Hist.} 7.101-105, in which Herodotus creates a conversation between the Persian Xerxes, and Demaratus, the king of the Spartans. The autocratic rule of the Persians is pitted against Greek “law” as a master, which offers a sure and invariable command: “they have a master, and that master is Law, . . . [w]hatever this master commands, they do; and his command never varies: it is never to retreat in battle, however great the odds, but always to remain in formation, and to conquer or die.” Herodotus, \textit{The Histories} (Further revised ed.; Aubrey de Sélincourt; London: Penguin Books, 2003).

\textsuperscript{98}Michael LeFebvre, \textit{Collections, Codes and Torah: The Re-Characterization of Israel’s Written Law} (LHBOTS 451; New York; London: T & T Clark, 2006), 239.


\textsuperscript{100}LeFebvre writes the following: “It is neither blood nor ethnicity which determines the “good guys” and “bad guys” in these accounts. Nor is it (surprisingly) religion.” The accounts named are from 1 and 2 Maccabees. LeFebvre, \textit{Collections, Codes, and Torah}, 238.

\textsuperscript{101}See the Introduction p. 3 for examples of other changes in groups.
But while scholarship confirms that Hellenism’s influence concerning the acceptance of Torah as a legislative law instigated the ability for Gentiles to “convert” to Judaism, there is little or no consensus regarding what a conversion actually entails. In other words, scholars are not in agreement with regard to what features are mutable and open to “conversion” in this late Second Temple period of Judaism. LeFebvre concludes that features of kinship and religious practice have been minimized, and the feature of a society’s rule of law has been emphasized, from what previously was one nonlegislative Torah which united elements of religious practice, the God of the land of Israel, and kinship. One could argue that for LeFebvre, the rule of law itself is “mutable,” and represents the entity to which another can change. But these features of kinship and religious practice are still present, along with the rule of law as connected to a society or land. It is possible that mutability of other features, or combinations of the features, are what effectively permit the conversion.

Shaye Cohen agrees that the innovation of Gentile conversions happens within the context of Hellenistic influence, and furthermore that this innovation stems from a separation of the features of “Jewishness.” In his influential work *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, he identifies what he perceives to be the individual features of “Judaism,” and also the manner in which these features realign to permit a conversion to Judaism within the Hasmonean era. The realignment begins with a separation of the concept of citizenship, represented as a way of life affiliated with a geographic region, from “ethnicity,” by which he implies shared Israelite kinship. This “way of life” was that *politea* decreed by Antiochus IV to happen in accordance with Judean ancestral laws as described in 2 Macc 11:25. Subsequently, a Judean feature that is this way of life—i.e., the newly legislative Torah ancestral laws—along with the religious practice of worshipping the God of Jerusalem, could be adopted. Cohen suggests that the earliest evidence of such an

---

act of conversion is the Idumeans’ voluntary circumcision and incorporation into the
Hasmonean state. Following Cohen’s argument, it is the mutable features of citizenship
and religious practice that make a conversion possible, when separated from a kinship that
remains immutable.

With respect to Cohen’s three features of “Jewishness” (citizenship with a connection
to a land or region, religious practice of worshipping the God of Israel, and kinship) other
scholars differ from his conclusion that the third feature of kinship is immutable, and argue
instead that in fact it is the mutable feature. Two scholars in particular critique Cohen in the
process of making just such an alternative argument. The first, Denise Kimber Buell,
summarizes Cohen’s argument to entail a shift in the Hellenistic period “from an emphasis on
birth to shared religious practices.” Kimber Buell instead suggests that “[i]f we do not
suppose that ethnicity entails a privileging of the “fixed” end of the spectrum, we can say
instead that the shift Cohen identifies entails a transformation in how ethnicity/race is defined,
with greater emphasis on its fluidity.” Kimber Buell is suggesting a notion of a fluid, or
mutable, kinship. The second scholar, Caroline Johnson Hodge, critiques Cohen’s findings by
arguing that “[n]o part of ethnicity is immutable and not subject to manipulation and
negotiation, not even kinship (especially not kinship.)” Johnson Hodge goes on to draw

concludes that the “rural Idumaeans joined the Judeans on their own initiative,” 110. Katell Berthelot
highlights that the circumcision of the Idumeans by Hyrcanus appears voluntary according to the account
Josephus to perceive these circumcisions (and conversions) to be voluntary, Steven Weitzman argues in an
opposing vein that the circumcisions “forced” by Hyrcanus upon Idumeans and Itureans are performed to
disguise “the absorption of local non-Jews as a continuation of the Maccabean drive to retake the land for
Judaism.” Steven Weitzman, “Forced Circumcision and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology,” *HTR* 92, no. 1 (1999): 58. Weitzman suggests that Hyrcanus is accepting Gentiles to fill work gaps, but forces
the circumcisions to avoid critique and mimic the circumcisions imposed upon Judeans by Mattathias (1 Macc
2:46). Despite this extreme position taken by Weitzman, overall it appears that some element of voluntary choice
was involved, and furthermore that the process of circumcision and following Judean laws enabled Idumeans and
Itureans to be viewed as having converted to Judaism, by Judean society.

University Press, 2005), 44.

\[107\] Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race*, 44.

\[108\] Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New
York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 54.
from the letters of Paul to argue for a notion of mutable ethnicity. These two scholars clearly lean away from the suggestion that it is only features of mutable citizenship and religious practice that permit a Gentile’s conversion to Judaism. Instead, they argue that it is the notion of kinship that is mutable and permits the conversion.

The comparison between these three scholars highlights that Cohen considers kinship to be immutable while Johnson Hodge and Kimber Buell consider it to be mutable. An emerging problem, however, is that each scholar describes kinship differently. Cohen equates ethnicity with “a descent group linked together by common blood,” which suggests that ethnicity comprises solely kinship. Kimber Buell uses the construct “race/ethnicity,” but also blurs any distinction between “race/ethnicity” and “cultural identity.” Johnson Hodge describes “kinship and ethnicity” as “social constructions” that can be understood in terms of biological relationship and common ancestry, but also other features such as “common practices, language, religion, or geographical region.” Therefore the notion of “ethnicity” has itself become a definitional argument that needs further clarification.

What this discussion highlights is the myriad ways in which scholarship concerning Hellenistic Judaism debates and interprets ethnic identity theory more broadly. At stake are two interrelated issues, namely “What is ethnicity?” and “Can it change?” Concerning the first issue, an ethnic identity could be seen, at a basic level, as comprising both features of kinship as well as common culture, including religion, customs, or language. Certainly one may observe features of both kinship and culture to be incorporated within late Second Temple Judean identity and conversion, according to those models of identity witnessed above as constructed by LeFebvre, Cohen, Kimber Buell, and Johnson Hodge. In addition to

---

109 A notion of mutable ethnicity where Paul is concerned consists of the idea that Paul believed in a Christian ethnicity, to which individuals could convert. See Johnson Hodge, If Sons, Then Heirs, 3–4.
110 Cohen, The Beginnings of Jewishness, 133.
111 Kimber Buell, Why This New Race, 44.
112 Johnson Hodge, If Sons, Then Heirs, 16.
113 Hall, Hellenicity, 8; also see below for the description of common culture as included in Hutchinson and Smith, “Introduction,” 7.
Judean/Israelite kinship, features of common culture were noted, including law, religious practice, and citizenship affiliated with a particular geographic region.

The matter of “conversion” returns readers to the second and interrelated part of the debate concerning ethnic identity, namely the question “Can it change?”, or, worded differently, “Is ethnic identity mutable?” The answer to this question has fluctuated around two poles, one which has argued for a “primordialist” outlook in which these features of ethnicity are argued to be understood by participants as “exterior, coercive, and ‘given’.” In such a model, ethnicity would remain fixed and immutable. Within the opposite pole, composed of “instrumentalists,” ethnicity is comprised as a “social, political, and cultural resource for different interest- and status-groups.” If ethnicity in the primordialist pole is “exterior” and “given,” then ethnicity in this socially constructed instrumentalist pole could be seen as “internal” and “chosen.” Henri Tajfel’s social identity model highlights the role played by an individual’s own awareness of membership in a group, as understood within the instrumentalist pole: “an individual’s self-concept . . . derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.”

This socially constructed, or “instrumentalist” pole has been heavily inspired in response to the work of Fredrik Barth, who argues that “boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them.” In other words, ethnicity is indeed mutable, and in fact is produced “in the course of social transactions that occur at or across (and in the process help to constitute) the ethnic boundary in question.” Drawing from the work of Barth, Richard

117 Barth, “Introduction,” 11. An anthropological example offered by Barth is that of the Yao people in China, which is an ethnic group whereby 10% non-Yao become Yao in each next generation, through a series of processes, including “adoption to kinship status.” Barth, “Introduction,” 22.
Jenkins suggests that “ethnic identities . . . are practical accomplishments rather than static forms. As such, they are immanently, although not necessarily, variable.”\footnote{Jenkins, “Rethinking Ethnicity,” 218.} Identities can change and therefore individuals can permeate across borders, which is the phenomenon of conversion presently under discussion within the time period of late Second Temple Judaism, influenced by a similar phenomenon in Hellenism.\footnote{Identifying the genesis of Judean conversions within the context of Hellenistic influence does not mean to indicate that Barth’s notion of mutable ethnicity does not apply to pre-Hellenistic Israel in some way, but rather that accounts of individuals or communities choosing to “convert,” undergo circumcision, and become recognized as “Judean” in features of both kinship and culture, only happens in light of Hellenistic influence. The present study is not arguing what ethnicity consisted of for Israel in the ancient near east and pre-Hellenistic Israel; instead, the observation is simply being made that any sort of mutable ethnicity in the ANE is not the same as what became known as a “conversion.” For arguments concerning ethnicity in ancient Israel, see, for example, Diana Edelman, “Ethnicity and Early Israel,” in Ethnicity and the Bible (ed. Mark G. Brett; Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996), 25–55 (who suggests that nothing concrete can be known concerning ethnicity in ancient Israel), and Kenton L. Sparks, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1998) (who believes that kinship is an important aspect of ancient Israelite ethnicity).} As noted previously, in that case specifically highlighting the Greek aptitude for a rule of law, barbarians could become Greek “by adopting Hellenic practices, customs and language.”\footnote{Hall, Hellenicity, 8.} Consequently, this practice of mutability was adopted when non-Judeans could become “Judean” by adopting “Jewish” law (Torah). The present debate concerning ethnicity in late Second Temple Judaism revolves around these issues of “ethnic” definition and mutability, and to what extent this description of ethnicity and its mutable features can apply to this period of time within Judaism.

Returning once more to the questions raised in the debate between Cohen and his critiquers concerning the nature of Judean ethnicity specifically, along with the features of Judean ethnicity that would become mutable to permit or deny conversions, two more scholars at this point will be added to the dialogue. Philip Esler and Steve Mason are two scholars who also argue against Cohen’s view that kinship is not mutable in a Judean conversion. Furthermore, Esler and Mason provide clear frameworks for an understanding of “ethnicity” within the context of Judaism in the ancient Mediterranean, and ethnicity theory from within the framework identified. Both define ethnicity more broadly than merely kinship. The
consequences of this definition, with which the present thesis concurs, are that the mutable features of “Judeanness” that permit Gentile conversions reach deeper than solely the feature of kinship. Indeed, for these writers, kinship continues to be a mutable feature partly responsible for the newly permitted conversion, but so also are other features, which Cohen had regarded separately.

Esler takes issue with Cohen’s favouring of kinship as the “prime test of ethnicity,” and instead prefers to define ethnicity by the features described by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith: “a common proper name”; “a myth of common ancestry”; shared “historical memories” or “memories of a common past”; “elements of common culture” normally including “religion, customs, or language”; “a link with a homeland”; and “a sense of solidarity.” This definition of ethnicity is much broader, although indeed the element of “kinship” is present within the notion of “a myth of common ancestry.” Furthermore, Esler includes the concept that ethnicity is mutable, evidenced by the fact that one can hold “dual or multi ethnicities.” Esler considers the Idumeans to be jointly “Idumean” and also “Judean,” where Cohen considers that the Idumeans convert to being Judean by taking on the mutable features of Judean citizenship in following legislative Torah and also religious practice, in particular the act of circumcision. Such a dual ethnicity implies mutability of ethnicity, although all three features established by Cohen of citizenship and a link with a homeland,
religious practice, and a notion of common kinship, are included within Esler’s broader notion of mutable ethnicity. Thus all three features, in addition to those additional three features of a common proper name, shared memories, and a sense of solidarity, are equally mutable and inseparable features in the conversion, according to Esler.

Similarly, Steve Mason draws heavily on the work of Josephus within the Greco-Roman world, and argues that conversion was “a movement from one ethnos to another, a kind of change in citizenship.” According to Mason, each ethnos may be defined by the following components:

[a] distinctive nature or character (φύσις, ἴθος), expressed in unique ancestral traditions (τὰ πάρτια), which typically reflected a shared (if fictive) ancestry (συγγενεία); each had its charter stories (μυθοί), customs, norms, conventions, mores, laws (νόμοι; ἡθη, νόμιμα), and political arrangements or constitution (πολιτεία).

Within the above framework, those features identified by Cohen are included. One observes a notion of common kinship (the shared ancestry), religious practice (included within Mason’s “customs” and etc.), and citizenship and connection to land (the “political arrangements”). Nevertheless Mason also differs from Cohen: while Cohen separated the features and considered the feature of kinship to be immutable, Mason’s definition of ethnos blends the features so that each is equally mutable. Mason argues that for Josephus, the nature of conversion is best framed within the categories of “ethnic and political, with a strong philosophical tinge.” In this regard Mason and Esler are alike, in that they both regard “conversion” to entail more than a shift in religious practice or custom and citizenship alone, as does Cohen.

Since religious practice is now clearly one of the three most broadly identified features of Second Temple “Judeanness,” then an important matter concerns how to describe a concept


\[127\] Mason, “Jews, Judeans,” 484.

of religious practice in this Hasmonean period through to the first century C.E. The first concern is definitional. A key concern on the part of both Mason and Esler is that Cohen describes a separate “religious component” of Judeanness, in contrasting an identity of immutable kinship with mutable religious and political identities.\textsuperscript{129} Esler observes that Cohen writes of “religion” as “existing as a realm of human experience,”\textsuperscript{130} while Mason critiques Cohen’s slide from “cultural” to “religious.”\textsuperscript{131} The reason behind these critiques rests in an argument that no concept of “religion” as an individual category existed yet during the Hasmonean period through to the first century C.E. Mason describes the matter in the following manner: “After discussing government, the military, architecture, social and family life, such surveys explain that what we seek to understand as religion permeated all of these parts and more of ancient existence, without yet being identifiable with any one of them.”\textsuperscript{132} Esler suggests that “religion” is only a post-Enlightenment concept.\textsuperscript{133}

Not everyone, however, takes such a late view. It may certainly be argued that a concept of “religion” was indeed in the process of formation during the Second Temple period, even if not yet fully formed. David Miller concludes the following: “Instead of attempting to defend a strong claim that a concept of religion existed, I am content with the weaker claim that religion was in the process of emerging as a distinct concept during the Second Temple period.”\textsuperscript{134} Certainly, the argument has been made that a concept of religious practice was understood as a feature of conversion by the first centuries C.E. Gary Porton argues that for the rabbinic texts of late antiquity, the kinship group consisting of “children of Israel” (בני ישראל) or “children of Jacob” was “created through a religious experience.”\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{130}Esler, Conflict and Identity, 70.
\textsuperscript{131}Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 494–5.
\textsuperscript{132}Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 482.
\textsuperscript{133}Esler, Conflict and Identity, 70.
Porton concludes that rabbis of late antiquity “viewed conversion both as a change in ethnic groups and as a movement between religious communities, for they perceived of the People Israel as both an ethnic group, united by genealogical ties, and as a religious community, joined together by a covenant with YHWH.”136 Clearly such activities noted by Cohen as monotheistic worship of “the God whose temple is in Jerusalem”137 could be described as a “religious practice,” incorporated within the realm of “common culture.” Nevertheless, because the features of ethnicity are all interconnected, it becomes difficult to label a practice separately as “religious” as different from “custom” or “culture.” The present study thus uses the term “common culture” to acknowledge these practices that locate themselves both apart from, and also overlap with, features of kinship and citizenship or connection to a land, and within a broader concept of ethnicity.

The second concern is to reiterate the practice of circumcision as a key component of “common culture” entailed in a conversion. Circumcision is the very sign of the covenant between YHWH and Abraham and his ancestors, as described in Gen 17:9-11. Among texts that deny conversions, a critical reason entails the belief that circumcision is impossible after the eighth day after birth, based on Gen 17:12. The book of Jubilees is one that takes such a literal interpretation, with eighth day requirements stipulated in Jub. 15:14 and also 15:25-26.138 On the other hand, other Judean groups felt that circumcision could happen for adult

138 Jub. 15:14 reads as follows: “The male who has not been circumcised on the eighth day—the flesh of whose foreskin has not been circumcised on the eighth day—that person will be uprooted from his people because he has violated my covenant.” Jub. 15:25-26 reads as follows: “This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. 26 Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover, there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God.” Translation from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (trans. James C. VanderKam; Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 88 Scriptorum Aethiopic; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Matthew Thiessen argues that the author of Jubilees considers conversion to be impossible. The emphasis on the eighth day circumcision as found in Jub. 15:25-26 “excludes the possibility that second-century B.C.E. Gentiles can become part of Jacob’s seed.” Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy*,
converts. As has already been noted, the Idumeans and Itureans underwent circumcision, for example. Achior joins the “house of Israel” and undergoes circumcision, in Judith 14:10, as a second example. Scholars consider this ritual of circumcision as only one component, although likely a definitive one, of conversion, noted by the fact that God-fearers followed other religious practices such as Temple worship, but did not undergo circumcision.\(^\text{139}\)

### 1.2.3 Problem and Significance Part III: Summary and Moving Ahead to the DSS

This section has demonstrated that overall, current scholarship does not prefer an interpretation of the \(gēr\) in the DSS as a Gentile convert to Judaism, who is included within the contemporary era of the Qumran movement. In part this conclusion is due to the socially closed nature of the Qumran movement, and in part the conclusion is understandable in light of the fact that the features of “conversion” are also presently disputed. The shift from Torah as a nonlegislative “religious practice,” to a legislative and citizenship-forming law brought about by Hellenistic influence, in some fashion freed Gentiles to become “Judeans.” Yet the underlying features that are open to “converting,” i.e., the features that are mutable, are

---


---

\(^{139}\)See, for example, Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 29;

\(^{139}\)It should be noted that Thiessen is reading Jubilees as a unified text by a single author, and does not take into account the proposal by James Kugel that Jub. 15:25-34 is fully added by a secondary “Interpolator.”

---

unclear. Certainly contemporary scholarship has observed the three features of common culture in the covenantal sign of circumcision, citizenship which includes a notion of connectedness to a land, and a shared notion of kinship, to feature strongly in late Second Temple “Judeanness.” But which of these features is mutable or not is disputed. Because all of the features fall within the overarching concept of ethnicity, should this mean that all three features would be mutable and part of a “conversion”?

Where does that leave the gēr of the DSS? As has been observed, the DSS regulate that movement members should stay away from Gentiles, such as that regulation in CD XI, 14-15 to keep away from Gentiles on the Sabbath. In such a case, how could a gēr appear on multiple occasions within the contemporary membership lists, as he does in CD XIV, 3-6 for example, if this gēr is a Gentile? The regulations do not seem solely reflective of an idealized or eschatological era in which the gēr would be either hypothetically included (per Donaldson), or excluded (per Moynihan Gillihan). Instead, many of the regulations appear to do with the everyday functions of the movement. In this case, if the gēr is a Gentile, movement members would be perpetually causing themselves to be impure. The fact remains that with the gēr present on thirteen different occasions within the DSS that employ the technique of scriptural rewriting, it then seems reasonable to consider this individual as a non-Gentile, at least on those occasions the gēr is included within the movement. In other words, in light of the known presence of Gentile conversions and their newly-defined convert status as a “gēr” within rabbinic texts, it seems likely that an element of mutability may also be present within the DSS. Why would the term appear so many times if the gēr was a Gentile? Therefore, the questions remain: how would that mutability or “conversion” be articulated? In what way is the former Gentile no longer a Gentile within the DSS? And how does the notion of circumcision become involved, keeping in mind that no clear conversion rituals are described for the admission of new members in either D or S rule traditions? Conversions and notions of mutable ethnicity have been considered already within many Judean environments
of the late Second Temple period and beyond, including those of the Idumeans, and the literature and Greco-Roman context of Josephus, Paul, and the early rabbinics. If scholarship can establish the identity of the gēr in the DSS as a Gentile convert, and determine what sort of mutable nature would permit (or immutable nature would deny) such a conversion, the findings would provide an important template of comparison against these and other late Second Temple and early Judean communities.

1.3 Response: Methodology

This thesis addresses the question of the gēr in the DSS and the Qumran movement’s levels of permeability toward outsiders with a two-step method. By way of preliminary overview, the first step involves a text and literary study of all occasions of the term gēr within the DSS, with the exception of those occasions closely mirroring majority scripture (meaning scripture that becomes the Masoretic Text). These DSS under consideration, in which the term gēr is employed, all utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting (see below for descriptions of the terms “majority scripture” and “scriptural rewriting”). The goal of this part of the study is to discover how the gēr might change between texts, which is why the study is limited to those occasions of the term gēr within the DSS.

140 Occasions of the term gēr occurring in majority scripture can be found in the following (here called “biblical texts”): Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert (vol. 3, Part 1 of DSSC; in consultation with Eugene C. Ulrich; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 173. The occasions of gēr in Abegg’s volume for the most part mirror closely the Masoretic Text (MT), except for a scant few examples of light rewriting that nevertheless do not change the overall meaning of the text, and do not provide enough rewriting to offer a point of comparison that would highlight a change in meaning between the rewritten text and the MT version. For example, the phylactery 8Q3, Frags. 17-25, 9 (Deut 10:19) adds the descriptor בֵּיתְךָ (“in your cities”) to the gēr, making the verse read “And you shall love the gēr in your cities, because you were גֶּרֶם in the land of Egypt” (translation my own). One would be tempted to argue the addition of “cities” to the verse suggests an authorship by the Damascus tradition, the tradition affiliated with the rule of D which describes members living in cities (e.g. CD XII, 19). Even if this were the case, however, overall this level of rewriting is too minimal to assess the meaning of the gēr. One further example, which could feasibly provide one sole occasion within Abegg’s list that is better suited to scriptural rewriting as opposed to the category of “biblical” majority scripture, is 8Q3 Frags. 17-25, 13. Here, Baillet, Milik and de Vaux argue that the phylactery transcribes יִהְיֶה לְגֵר (“There shall be one law for the foreigner and the gēr,” translation mine), which would effectively demonstrate a substitution of נִ죠ּר (the native born) with גֶּרֶם (the foreigner), in this verse from Exod 12:49. However, the word reconstructed as נִ죠ּר is very uncertain, being reconstructed right where two fragments join. Furthermore, most of Exod 12:48-49 is missing in 8Q3, and the space available would not fit the full extent of text, so any analysis would be most hypothetical in that the full context cannot be understood. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran: Textes (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 153–54.
texts that utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting. In texts that remain uniform, no changes can be observed. The gēr has already served as a proven indicator of change in the past in the Hebrew Bible and rabbinic texts, highlighting the sociohistorical shift from “resident alien” to “convert,” and thus this figure may continue to serve in this capacity. The literary study of the term gēr in and of itself may offer sociohistorical observations.

To continue the preliminary overview of the thesis method, the second step involves a sociohistorical comparison between the findings made from the textual analysis of the gēr in the Qumran movement, with epigraphic and papyrological evidence from another related type of group(s). Because the Qumran movement is arguably responding, along with late Second Temple Judaism more generally, to conversions inspired by a Hellenistic cultural milieu, it will be appropriate to draw upon a comparison to Greco-Roman associations as the related “group(s).” Even though observing textual changes within various rewritings can highlight sociohistorical changes made over time (in this case, in particular concerning the term gēr), a comparison with other types of evidence is an important step to confirm the findings. Jonathan Hall articulates the matter in the following manner: “[t]he signification of the written word is seldom transparent – despite the claims of the author – and needs to be gauged contextually by reading that particular document against the background of other literary and non-literary evidence.”

The results from the textual and literary study of the occasions where the term gēr is employed within the technique of scriptural rewriting in the DSS can thus be strengthened with a sociohistorical comparison.

This method of analyzing a text’s reception history and subsequently comparing the changes observed against sociohistorical observations has been used successfully by other scholars, such as Cecilia Wassen in her study Women in the Damascus Document. Wassen pursues a close reading of selected passages concerning women in D, examining changes

---

141 Hall, Hellenicity, 24.
142 Wassen, Women.
made to the texts that appear over time. The present study’s use of comparisons between occasions where the term gēr has been employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS parallels Wassen’s use of source-critical and redactional studies in order to achieve this first task. The changes observed within the texts Wassen then analyzes as a second step, from a sociohistorical perspective concerning the status of women in the Second Temple period.

The first step will take place at the textual level, analyzing the gēr as the term contrasts among various occasions: occasions where the term has been used within the scope of scriptural rewriting; majority scriptural passages which are identifiable as comparative texts; and occasionally other DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting which are similar to passages that employ the term gēr. At this point, a few definitions are in order.

The first term to define is that of “scripture.” Eugene Ulrich defines a book of scripture to be “a sacred authoritative work believed to have God as its ultimate author, which the community, as a group and individually, recognizes and accepts as determinative for its belief and practice for all time and in all geographical areas.” Ulrich’s general wording regarding God as the “ultimate author” suggests more than one interpretation, presumably relevant for multiple traditions. God as the “ultimate author” could imply an interpretation that God generally inspired the creation of a text composed by human hands; the wording

\[\text{---}\]

143 One point of differentiation should be noted between the method used by Wassen and the method of the present study. Whereas Wassen compares the passages within D both “within the context of their literary layers and according to the approximate chronological order of the strata,” as well as compares the passages from D “to their biblical Vorlage” on the occasions that laws of interest in D “are interpretations of biblical laws,” the present study is not focused on making comparisons between any chronological strata between the DSS under question. Many of the texts under consideration are quite fragmentary and, as such, apart from the texts of D, the present study draws from the second form of comparison identified in Wassen’s work, which is that of comparing DSS to biblical Vorlage predecessors (or in the words of the present study, “majority scripture,” see below). Wassen, Women, 13, 16.

144 For example, Wassen considers additions made to the prescribed ordeal for a suspected adulteress of Num 5:11-31, reinterpreted in 4Q270 Frag. 4, 1-21. Wassen observes that a recorded voice for the accused woman has been added to the text apart from her recitation of “Amen, Amen” (Num 5:22), namely the following inclusion in line 3: “if she said, I was raped.” Wassen considers this addition to the text an attempt to improve a woman’s legal position compared to the scriptural Vorlage. See Wassen, Women, Ch. 3, esp. 65-68.

could also imply that God divinely mandated the wording of a text and divinely sanctioned these words to be written through a human hand. More specifically pertaining to the Qumran movement, Sidnie White Crawford suggests scripture to adhere to the following criteria, of which some or all should be met:

(1) The work is quoted or alluded to as having special authority or scriptural status. Formulae such as “thus says the Lord” or “as it is written” are helpful indicators. (2) The work is the subject of a commentary, such as Pesher Nahum or Pesher Habakkuk. (3) The work claims for itself divine authority, for example by attribution to Moses. (4) If the work is preserved in a large number of copies, that may point to scriptural status or at least special importance.146

Note that in point three, divine authority can be granted by a text’s association with a figure sanctioned by God to act or speak as an intermediary, offering a third interpretation to Ulrich’s definition of God as the “ultimate author” of scripture. Overall, then, even if the manner in which a text achieves divine status is open to question and may vary, the fact that a text is sacred (and consequently scripture) can also be recognized by those other features described by White Crawford. Taking all of the above into consideration, a simplified working definition of scripture for this thesis is that general definition given by Molly Zahn, who affiliates scripture with “any text or group of texts considered sacred and authoritative by a particular religious tradition.”147

The second term, and in this case, set of terms, to define are those of “rewritten scripture” and “scriptural rewriting.” Anders Petersen describes “rewritten scripture” as the following: “that particular type of intertextuality which exists between an authoritative scriptural antecedent and its subsequent reuse in a type of rewriting, in which there is a close

textual relationship between the scriptural predecessor and the rewritten work.” 148 This definition implies that the rewritten work may not necessarily be esteemed as “scripture” itself, which is an appropriate application within the scope of the present study. For example, one of the texts used within the present study is the Damascus Document, which is a rule text and is clearly an authoritative text because of its existence in multiple (fragmentary) copies at Qumran. However, the Damascus Document may not be regarded as “scripture” itself by the Qumran movement. The work is a rule text, but does not claim divine authority for itself. For that reason the present study considers the terms “rewritten scripture” and “reinterpreted, or rewritten text” to be interchangeable. Most important, Peterson defines rewritten scripture as a “textual strategy” and not a clearly-defined genre. 149 To be as clear as possible that the present study also regards rewritten scripture as a “textual strategy,” or even a “textual technique,” and not a genre with a set number of included texts, 150 this study will furthermore recast the descriptor “rewritten scripture” (which could be construed as a proper noun describing a set genre) as the verbal adjective “scriptural rewriting.”

The definitions “rewritten scripture” and “scriptural rewriting” lead to another question, which is the matter concerning to what “scriptural predecessor” the scriptural rewriting of the DSS is actually referring. Because in this time period there is yet no closed canon of scripture, 151 the present thesis resists the term “rewritten Bible” (or “biblical rewriting”). Nevertheless, the authoritative scriptural predecessors being compared in this study are those scriptural books which will become the majority canon, meaning the

---

149 Petersen, “Riverrun of Rewriting,” 484.
150 For an overview of the progression of the terms rewritten Bible and rewritten scripture as both genre and subsequently category (similar to “textual strategy”), see the Introduction in White Crawford, Rewriting Scripture, 1–18, esp. 9–13.
151 See Timothy Lim’s discussion regarding the earliest canonical lists and his argument that the closing of the canon for rabbinic Judaism likely occurred between 150-250 C.E. Timothy H. Lim, The Formation of the Jewish Canon (AYBRL; New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013), 35–53.
Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible.  

Therefore when classifying scripture specifically as that which will become the Hebrew Bible, the term to be employed will be “majority scripture.” In the present study, the specific element to be compared will be the figure of the gēr within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, with the gēr of these majority scriptures, contrasted by such means as additions, conflations, omissions, or substitutions.

The thesis acknowledges that there is a certain element of anachronism present in comparing an interpreted text against a base form in a book that technically does not exist yet as canon and furthermore may contain a fluid form within the text itself. In this regard, the thesis works in the reverse direction of the process identified by Michael Fishbane as “inner-biblical exegesis,” which he identifies as a process that “starts with the received Scripture and moves forward to the interpretations based on it.”

Nevertheless, the present study starts with the DSS themselves, because the Qumran movement behind them is the direct object of inquiry of this study. Because thirty-five percent of the corpus of Qumran “biblical texts” make use of a proto-Masoretic text, and this Masoretic tradition followed a progressive trend of “diminishing textual variation,” it is reasonable to liken the MT of the Hebrew Bible (canon) with whatever proto-majority scriptures existed at the time of the Qumran movement. Furthermore, even though some textual fluidity occurs within scriptural books as they exist at the time of the Qumran movement, certainly the fact that translations of the Torah and other scriptural books take effect in the third and second centuries B.C.E., respectively, suggests that a written culture exists whereby text versions are known and may be compared. The textual premise of the first step of the study, to seek out “[majority] scriptural predecessors,” is sound.

152 See Emanuel Tov’s discussion regarding the Masoretic tradition representing a common and authoritative form of the Hebrew Bible from the second century C.E. onwards. Tov, Textual Criticism, 22–23.
154 Tov, Textual Criticism, 22–39, 115. A proto-Masoretic text contains the consonantal framework of the MT.
155 Tov, Textual Criticism, 34–35.
156 Tov, Textual Criticism, 136–37.
This first step of the study will not include any occasions where the term *gēr* has been hypothesized within scriptural rewriting in the DSS but for which no material manuscript evidence exists. Such exclusions include the following hypothesized textual reconstructions: “your offspring shall be a *gēr*” in 4Q464, Frag. 3, II, 4,¹⁵⁷ derived from Gen 15:13; “the Levite, and the *gēr*, and the orphan, and the widow,” within 4Q159 Frag. 1, II, 3, derived from both Num 18:30 and Deut 14:29;¹⁵⁸ and the proposed fourth generation *gēr* of *TS* XXXIX, 5, derived from Gen 15:13-16.¹⁵⁹ Also covered within this exclusion is the book of Jubilees, which contains one passage with what would likely be a reference to a *gēr* in Jub. 50:7: “You will work for six days, but on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord your God. Do not do any work on it — you, your children, your male and female servants, all your cattle, or the foreigner who is with you.” The passage included above is James VanderKam’s translation which draws primarily on the Ethiopic translation, which is the only full version of the book. There is no textual evidence for this passage extant at Qumran.¹⁶⁰ Finally, as has been implied above, the present study is not making any claims regarding the *gēr* employed within majority scripture in the DSS.

The second step involves a sociohistorical comparison between the findings made from the occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting, and

¹⁵⁷ E. Eshel and M. Stone reconstruct a reading of Gen 15:13, based on the opening of line 3 (םזאץ לאבר), and the opening of line 4 (וֹנַד), which taken together could imply a slightly variant reading of Gen 15:13. However, lines 2 and 5 do not relate in any way to verses 12 nor 14 respectively, so it is impossible to know how closely this passage would follow Gen 15:13. E. Eshel and M. Stone, “4QExposition on the Patriarchs,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (in consultation with James C. VanderKam; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 222.

¹⁵⁸ See the section on 4Q159 in Ch. 2, section 2.3.2.4, n. 98.

¹⁵⁹ See Hamidović’s discussion on the matter in the introductory chapter, section 1.2.1.5. Note that Yadin also considers such a reading to be possible. See Yigael Yadin, *Introduction* (vol. 1 of *The Temple Scroll*; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 247; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2, 166.

¹⁶⁰ Jubilees, a book whereby fifteen copies of manuscript evidence in Hebrew have been located at Qumran, would be included within the scope of the present study’s rendering of both scripture and scriptural rewriting. Jubilees itself is likely regarded as scripture by members within the Qumran movement, due to the multiple copies located on site. The book’s retelling of Genesis 1 to Exodus 12 make the account one of scriptural rewriting, too. The passage matches that of Exod 20:10 in the Septuagint and Old Latin. See Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology* (JSISup 117; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 1; VanderKam, *Jubilees, an Edition*, vi-xxxii, 326, n. Jub. 50:7.
another type of group, namely Greco-Roman associations, which contain similarities to the Qumran movement. Similarities have been noted between regulations as found in D and S on the one hand and Greco-Roman associations on the other. For example, Moshe Weinfeld and others identify similarities between the codes of Greco-Roman associations, alongside various components of the organizational rules of D and S. 161 Among a number of regulations, Weinfeld observes similarities in the instructions on acceptance of new group members. For both Greco-Roman associations and also D and S regulations, joining candidates undergo examination, registration, and acceptance by vote. 162 Furthermore, Philip Harland describes Greco-Roman inscriptions whereby “fellow members of an association, who appear to be unrelated in a literal sense, address one another or name themselves in familiar terms using the term “brother” (adelphos).” 163 The study of the occasions where the term gēr has been employed within scriptural rewriting will find that frequently the gēr is also named as a Qumran movement “brother.” The gēr as a brother appears to share in the same kinship as other members of the Qumran movement. A comparison of these overlapping elements of brotherly language between DSS and Greco-Roman associations will either strengthen or weaken the theory of brotherly language representing a notion of shared kinship among members, representative also of a larger concept of shared and mutable ethnicity. Because the gēr appears to have taken on a shared kinship with other brothers of the Qumran movement,

161 Moshe Weinfeld, The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period (Fribourg, Suisse; Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). A recent monograph that includes a detailed summary of other Qumran movement and Greco-Roman association comparative works, and on its own considers the “covenanters” to have a civic ideology, approximating the model of a state, is the following: Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters’ Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012). By way of another example, Martin Hengel also observes similarities between the Qumran movement (described as the yahad) and groups within Hellenistic circles. For example, he observes the Hellenistic ideal of shared possessions, practiced among the “Essenes,” and also draws upon other similarities such as the practice of examination by members of the Qumran movement, similar to Greek young men joining associations. Martin Hengel, “Qumran and Hellenism,” in Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000), 48–51.
162 Weinfeld, Organizational Pattern, 21–23.
to explore notions of brotherhood between the Qumran movement and Greco-Roman associations, which relate in behaviour and overlap in time period, seems reasonable.

It is by means of this second step, that of a sociohistorical comparison of the DSS occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting to other examples where familial language represents possible newly forged kinship liaisons, that a new understanding of the DSS movement’s social structure(s) and attitudes toward Gentiles is confirmed. In all cases of the *gēr* in the DSS, this figure represents a “convert,” whether included as a Judean, or excluded as “yet a Gentile.” The comparison will highlight that where Greco-Roman associations are concerned, brother language also appears to represent a newly forged shared notion of kinship among association members who share a sense of ethnic identity.

### 1.4 Chapter Outlines

Chapters 2-4 represent the first step of literary and textual analysis. The term *gēr* in the texts is the literary feature guiding the study; a sociohistorical comparison will be drawn only in Chapter 5. Chapter 2 briefly introduces each of the thirteen occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS and confirms the actual textual inclusion of the term where necessary, as most excerpts are fragmentary. Next, the chapter reviews how scholars have dated the texts in which the term “*gēr*” occurs and how they have understood the texts’ provenance. This exercise observes how each document compares chronologically to determine whether each fits within the timeline of the Qumran movement. The chapter includes a brief overview of the Qumran movement’s time frame and compositional relationship between CD and 1QS. In particular, regarding provenance, the chapter assesses whether each text may correlate with the D (*Damascus Document*) or S (*Serek ha-Yahad, the Rule of the Community*) rule traditions, which comprise the two major rule perspectives within the Qumran movement. Because the D and S rule traditions have already been established to demonstrate different degrees of social closure, the study keeps
this question of provenance in mind, in case the meaning of the *gēr* is consequently found to show differences between the traditions. It is possible that the texts may also not relate to either D or S. Charting correlations between the texts where the term *gēr* has been employed and D or S may reveal differences in attitudes toward the *gēr* within the Qumran movement.

Chapter 3 compares the DSS occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting. The chapter starts with the textual occasions and from there casts points of comparison to other texts, since this study is based on observations made from changes between texts. As previously described, this part of the study proceeds on the notion that “scriptural rewriting” reflects a tradition of a recognizable scriptural predecessor, with various levels of scribal manipulation present. The “manipulation” may take varied forms, such as textual additions, conflations, omissions, or substitutions. Even in the cases where the employed *gēr* occasions are located within works that appear primarily “to have been derived not from Scripture, but simply from the exigencies of communal life” such as the community code of D, recognizable “scriptural” parallels can also be observed, permitting differences between materials to stand out. At this textual and literary level, what is happening to the *gēr* between texts? In other words, what changes made to the occasions where the term *gēr* is employed between majority scripture and scriptural rewriting in the DSS indicate changed attitudes toward (heretofore) outsiders? The chapter puts forward preliminary observations concerning the meaning of the *gēr* within each text.

Chapter 4 assesses the findings from Chapters 2 and 3 to forge conclusions based on those provenance, literary and textual findings concerning the identity of the *gēr*, and more

165 Sarianna Metso has successfully argued that within the Qumran legal text tradition, “certain halakhic traditions emerged independently from Scripture, and they were secondarily connected with the texts of the Torah.” For example, the oath to be sworn by incoming members as written in the secondarily expanded 1QS V, 7-20 contains scriptural references that are not present in the earlier versions of the oath, found in 4QS b IX, 6-13 and 4QS a I, 5-11. Sarianna Metso, “Creating Community Halakhah,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible. Qumran and the Septuagint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006), 279, 281–92, 299.
broadly, the identity of a Qumran movement member. This Introduction observed that generally, late Second Temple “Judeanness” has been found to emphasize the following three features: a shared notion of kinship; citizenship which includes a notion of connectedness to land; and common culture in the practice of circumcision. The Introduction asked which of these features might be mutable in order to enable a Gentile’s conversion to Judaism. If all three features are classified within a broader structure of “ethnicity,” then it seems that all three features could demonstrate either mutability or immutability. The findings from Chapters 2 and 3 coincide with these three features of ethnicity and will be collated accordingly.

The first feature of shared kinship in brotherhood stems from the frequency with which the gēr is found to be synonymous with a brother. Many of the texts also draw a connection between movement members and a connection to “land,” even though this land is described in nonconcrete terms, making up the second feature of citizenship and land. The third feature consists of common culture. In particular, if the thesis argues that the gēr may represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, what do these texts say about the important act of circumcision which represents the covenant to exclusive relationship with YHWH? The excerpts with the occasions where the gēr has been employed do not mention circumcision specifically, and consequently the matter has not yet been investigated. The study can now look further afield to other texts that relate to the traditions of D and S to see what is written regarding circumcision, and relate these findings to the texts under consideration where the term gēr has been employed. The findings from this chapter will suggest that a Qumran movement member has an ethnic identity strongly rooted in these three features, and that it is the mutability or immutability of these features that permits or denies a Gentile convert to Judaism within the Qumran movement.

A sociohistorical comparison to Greco-Roman associations, which is the second step of the present study’s approach, takes place in Chapter 5. In particular, it is the first feature of
shared kinship through brotherhood language which will be used as a point of comparison, because the term is used frequently to denote fellow group members both in the Qumran movement and in Greco-Roman associations. It will be shown that cultic associations appear to bring member “brothers” into a shared ethnicity by means of familial and adoption language, making the reality of “brotherhood” kinship reasonable also for membership in Judean groups such as the Qumran movement.

The conclusion will highlight that the \( gēr \) is a Judean convert within the DSS, and that a notion of mutable ethnicity is involved in conversions. The \( gēr \) will indeed prove a useful indicator to demonstrate how conversion works in one example of a movement within the later Second Temple period. The \( gēr \) is a Gentile convert to Judaism, accepted within the Qumran movement in the texts correlated with the D tradition. However, where texts correlated with the S tradition are concerned, even though the \( gēr \) represents that same Gentile convert to Judaism, the convert is now excluded from the movement. Qumran movement members within the S tradition have themselves become “supra-Judeans” of a more stringent covenant seemingly unavailable to converts. Attitudes toward circumcision appear to influence these outcomes. Thus the study will find that the \( gēr \) is always a Judean convert, whether included as a Judean Qumran movement member, or excluded as “yet a Gentile.”
Chapter 2
Provenance and Dating of the Occasions Where the Term *Gēr*
Has Been Employed within Scriptural Rewriting in the DSS

The aim of this thesis is to discern a meaning for the term *gēr* within the DSS. The study proceeds by means of an examination of the term *gēr* where it is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, followed by a sociohistorical comparison. In order to do such a study, a preliminary task exists whereby DSS that employ the term *gēr* must be assessed to verify whether they correlate with the sectarian Qumran movement more broadly, and also whether they correlate with either of the two primary rule traditions belonging to this movement more specifically. This chapter addresses that preliminary task, with a review of the provenance and dating of the DSS in which the term *gēr* has been employed within the context of scriptural rewriting. In addition to establishing a date of composition for each text to confirm that it may indeed fit within the parameters of the Qumran movement behind the D (*Damascus Document*) or S (*Serek-ha Yahad*, the *Rule of the Community*) traditions, this chapter assesses whether each text may align specifically to one of these traditions of D or S. This specific query has yielded divergent theories in the case of some texts, and those outcomes must be reassessed. This query has never before been undertaken in the case of certain other of the selected texts, and the evidence must be assessed for the first time. Determining a possible D or S provenance to each text will test the differences in social closure between the traditions of D and S, in relation to attitudes toward the *gēr* to be studied afterward. Charting correlations with D or S may reveal differences in attitudes toward the *gēr* within the Qumran movement. It is also possible that not every text will correlate with D or S.

In order to accomplish this preliminary task, the chapter begins with a brief overview of the dating, provenance, and compositional relationship of the D and S rule texts and the
Qumran movement in which they are found. It will be seen that only the dating of the movement can be established with any real certainty and not an identification with any particular existing group (e.g., Zadokites or Essenes). Consequently, it is better to assess texts for their possible relationship to the D and S traditions as they are evidenced, rather than to other hypothetical groups. Second, the chapter proceeds with a brief overview of the manner in which the provenance and dating of each text is deduced. Finally, the texts will each be assessed and categorized according to both their established correlation with D, S, or something else, and also to their chronological ordering within those correlations. Because the excerpts are fragmentary to varying degrees, each text entry will begin with a verification of the actual textual inclusion of the term gēr, and will incorporate text-critical assessments to confirm the reading of the phrase. For the most part, the DJD editions of the texts and their translations are used; alternatives or supplements are identified.¹ The gēr in the text is always left untranslated. The chapter will discover the following: one text appears to precede the D and S traditions; three texts correlate with the Qumran movement overall, but a clear choice in correlation with either the D or S traditions remains indeterminate; and the remaining nine texts correlate with one or the other of these two primary traditions of the Qumran movement.

2.1 Overview of the Provenance of the Qumran Movement and the Damascus and Serek Traditions

In the effort to discern dating and provenance for each text under consideration with the Qumran movement and subsequently with either the D or S rule traditions, a preliminary step exists: an assessment of the dating and provenance of the Qumran movement itself, as well as the compositional relationship between the D and S rule traditions. The general sectarian nature of the Qumran movement (including the maintenance of higher purity standards) along

¹A few changes to translations have been made: יִשְׂרָאֵל is always translated as “children of Israel.” Other changes are noted where they occur.
with an acknowledgement of noted differences in social closure between D and S traditions, have been discussed previously in the introductory chapter. What follows now is a brief overview concerning the dating and provenance of the Qumran movement, including the status of the relationship between the D and S traditions, based on past and present scholarship. Potential implications of these findings on the present study are also assessed.

2.1.1 The Qumran Movement: Deposed Zadokite Priests?

Earlier Qumran scholarship dated the presence of the Teacher of Righteousness, considered the founder of the Qumran movement according to CD I, 11, sometime around the era of the Maccabean revolt and the mid-second century B.C.E. This dating was based on a literal reading of CD I, 5-11 which interprets the Teacher’s rise to have taken place three hundred and ninety years after Jerusalem fell to Babylon (587 B.C.E.), in addition to twenty years of further searching. Even when the number “390” was no longer considered an historical number by the standards of modern history, the mid-second century B.C.E. and the era of the Maccabees was still considered a reasonable time frame because the members of the Qumran movement appeared to identify themselves as deposed priests, being the “sons of Zadok” (CD III, 18-IV, 11; 4Q266 Frag. 5, I, 16; 1QS V, 2-3; V, 9). The Qumran site seemed ideal as a settlement site for those priests deposed from the Jerusalem Temple by the Maccabees, especially since Roland de Vaux dated a period “1a” of habitation at the site from circa 130-100 B.C.E., which would fit with the theory of a post-Maccabean Temple priest migration.

2See the Introduction chapter of the present study, section 1.1.1.
5De Vaux uncovered one coin at the site of Qumran dating to the period of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 B.C.E.), and one dating to the period of Judah Aristobulus (104-103 B.C.E.). de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 19.
Subsequently, scholarship has determined that membership within the Qumran movement is not literally comprised of Zadokite priests. First, the term “sons of Zadok” is a later textual tradition within the DSS. Furthermore, the reference to sons of Zadok within CD III, 21-IV, 1 is borrowed in a symbolic fashion from Ezek 44:15. And finally, archaeological scholarship now suggests that the site was not taken over by the Qumran movement until the first half of the first century B.C.E., 100-50 B.C.E. Certainly, some manuscripts of D and S date within the second century B.C.E., (4QS dates to somewhere within the second half of the second century B.C.E., and 4Q266 represents an “idiosyncratic Hasmonaean semi-cursive hand”). However, the evidence suggests that members of the Qumran movement are clearly not Zadokite priests who were deposed from the Temple, eradicating the need for a mid-second century date for the movement’s genesis. The actual date for those manuscripts need not be mid-second century, but could range from late second century to within the first century B.C.E. Had scholarship persistently established the Qumran movement to consist of Zadokite priests, certainly the presence of a gēr, as a Gentile

---

6Sarianna Metso’s argument has found wide acceptance that the “sons of Zadok” have been secondarily added within 1QS, because the term is missing from the parallel texts of 4QS. Metso, “Creating,” 283–89. Heinz-Josef Fabry also observes a textual development of Aaronide and Zadokite traditions within the DSS; Fabry concludes that “an original Aaronitic dominance was gradually superceded by a Zadokite one.” Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context (ed. Charlotte Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 249. Charlotte Hempel also concludes that “sons of Zadok” is a later tradition than “sons of Aaron” within the DSS. Charlotte Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez (ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 207–24.

7On this passage, Maxine Grossman writes the following: “The primary concern here is not for a hereditary or ritual priesthood but rather for the members of the community who have taken on a metaphorical priestly identity.” Maxine Grossman, “Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 (ed. Jamres R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 127.


10See section 2.2.2 of the present chapter that describes the paleography dating system of Frank Moore Cross, whereby a “Hasmonaean” script could date anywhere between ca. 150-30 B.C.E.
convert to Judaism, in the texts and in the community would be most unusual. However, generally the Zadokite theory is no longer endorsed, due to the above-noted recognition of redaction history and a later dating for the movement than originally thought. The present study is free to imagine all possibilities for the gēr.

2.1.2 The Qumran Movement and Prevailing Dating

Corroborating the notion of a later date than the mid-second century B.C.E. for the movement’s genesis, contemporary scholarship places the Teacher of Righteousness in the late second century or early first century B.C.E., and suggests that “the high tide of his movement was the first century B.C.E.”¹¹ Michael Wise uses historical references, in particular references to identifiable names of historical rulers, in order to date the movement of the Teacher of Righteousness, the figure he affiliates with the Qumran movement.¹² He bases his evidence on the theory that the Teacher was a figure affiliated to the sectarian compositions located at Qumran. Therefore, to chart the dating and frequency of the compositions themselves would consequently chart the rise and fall of the Teacher’s movement.¹³ Because there are no historical references or allusions between the dates 30 B.C.E. and 70 C.E. noted in any Qumran writings, it is in this fashion that Wise concludes that the Teacher’s movement had fallen out of popularity or ceased to exist by this time.¹⁴ The present study agrees with the notion of a late second century or early first century dating for the genesis of the movement, because texts belonging to the movement, and relevant to the present study, will be found to exist in that time period. However, the present study would amend the date suggested by Wise of the movement’s downfall (roughly 30 B.C.E. onward). Over the course of this chapter, a few manuscripts correlated with the D and S traditions will be found to date into the first century C.E. And, the site of Qumran is known

¹³Wise identifies sectarian writings as those “works whose language and concept demonstrably evidence origin with the Teacher or his movement.” Michael O. Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness,” 59.
to have been settled until its destruction by the Romans in 68 C.E.\(^{15}\) Thus it appears that the movement still carried on, and copied manuscripts, after the end of the first century B.C.E., even if the movement may have been waning, or perhaps transforming into something else.

### 2.1.3 The Qumran Movement: Essenes?

While a commencement period of the late second or early first centuries B.C.E. is established, the provenance of the sectarians behind this movement is still uncertain, once the Zadokite theory is negated. Presently, a lingering theory regarding the identity of the Qumran movement is that they are in fact the sectarian group known as Essenes. Even though the scrolls never self-identify as “Essenian,” this theory has maintained an audience because of the literature of Pliny the Elder, Philo, and Josephus, whose roughly first century C.E. descriptions of “Essenes” match in certain ways to the Qumran movement as it is understood through the Damascus and Serek rule texts.\(^{16}\) However, these Latin and Greek sources do not match what is described in the rule texts in all aspects, including the issue of locale, the sharing of possessions, and the matter of celibacy.

For example, on the topic of locale, Philo writes that Essenes live in villages (Good Person 76; Hypothetica 11.2); Josephus writes that the Essenes live in colonies in a number of cities (J.W. 2.123); and Pliny the Elder insists that the Essenes live in solitude to the west of the Dead Sea (Nat. 5.73). S describes communities of ten men (1QS VI, 1-8) and alludes to a desert location (1QS VIII, 14), which is a citation from Isa 40:3, but never mentions living in villages or cities. D refers to groups living either in cities (CD XII, 19) or camps (CD VII, 6; XII, 22-23; XIV, 17). The accounts do not all match, apart from the fact that multiple residence sites seem normative (and Pliny’s account does not preclude this possibility).

\(^{15}\)Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, see Ch. 4, 47–72.
\(^{16}\)English translations of the passages that follow which refer to Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder’s Essene accounts are collated within Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).
On the topic of shared possessions, Philo suggests the Essenes share their possessions and resources (Good Person 11.4). S makes various references to the notion of shared wealth, such as members submitting wealth (1QS I, 12); members sharing in law and possessions (1QS V, 2; VI, 19-20; VI, 22); and members receiving punishment if caught lying concerning possessions (1QS VI, 25). D, on the other hand, does not legislate in this regard.

Finally, on the topic of celibacy, once more accounts do not all match, between the Latin and Greek sources, as well as between these sources and the rule texts themselves. Philo suggests that no children, adolescents or women are permitted within the Essenes (Hypothetica 11.3); Josephus describes both a group of marrying Essenes, as well as Essenes who do not marry (J.W. 2.160-161; J.W. 2.120); and Pliny the Elder implies that the Essenes live celibate lives, in writing that they renounce love (Nat 5.73). When this topic of celibacy is contrasted against the two primary rule texts found at Qumran, D makes regulations dealing with the varied topics of women, marriage, and children (CD V, 7-10; VII, 6-7; XIII, 16; XIII, 17-18; XVI, 10-12). In contrast, S makes no mention of women and children.

On these topics of locale, shared possessions, and celibacy, the accounts of Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder on occasion match with D and on occasion with S, but never describe the full picture of either D or S to a satisfactory extent. These findings suggest numerous possibilities. One possibility is to suggest that the Qumran movement is something completely other than the Essenes. Too many of the Essene descriptions reported in the Greek and Latin accounts referenced above might draw from secondary knowledge, be made up completely, or be stylized to please a Hellenistic audience,17 thus corrupting the

---

17For example, Steve Mason argues that the account of marrying Essenes provided by Josephus is wholly made up, and argues that Josephus has set up the Essenes to portray Roman values that will appeal to an audience in Rome. Mason believes the persons behind the Qumran movement, and the Essenes as described by Josephus, to be different groups. Steve Mason, “What Josephus Says About the Essenes in His Judean War,” in Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson (ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins; Studies in Christianity and Judaism 9; Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2000), 429, 447–50.
reliability of these sources. As noted above, a second option is to believe that the similarities are close enough to argue a plausible Essene identity for the Qumran movement.\textsuperscript{18} A third possibility is to suggest that the Essenes may actually be an outgrowth of the Qumran movement.\textsuperscript{19} This possibility makes sense in light of the fact that the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder all date to roughly the first century C.E., which would place the accounts toward the end of the Qumran movement and the destruction of the site.

Meanwhile, the rule texts of D and S stem in large part from the first century B.C.E. It is feasible that the groups behind the D and S traditions, especially that of S,\textsuperscript{20} could have become the “Essenes” of the later accounts. In other words, the Qumran movement could be “pre-Essene.” In this case, members of the Qumran movement are technically not the same Essenes as those described in the first century sources, and to make such a connection is neither accurate nor necessary for the present task. To know whether the Qumran movement was Essene would help to verify the questionable historicity of the Greek and Latin sources and the nature of the Essenes in the first and second centuries C.E. and beyond, but the present study does not need the accounts of Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder to assess the texts as they correlate with the traditions of D and S.


\textsuperscript{19}See, for example, Eyal Regev, \textit{Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective} (RelSoc 45; Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007), 243–66.

\textsuperscript{20}The present study concurs with the view put forward by Collins that the Greek and Latin accounts correspond more closely to the tradition behind S. This observation need not impact the argument that follows below concerning a “parent” tradition behind either D or S. Collins, “Sectarian Communities,” 164.
2.1.4 The Relationship between D and S: Chronology

Because it is apparent that no firm connection may be made between the Qumran movement and any preexisting category or group, it is much better to simply consider the provenance of D and S on their own literary and textual terms. While scholarship has acknowledged the differences between these two rule traditions, the status of their exact relationship remains unclear. Under discussion is the matter concerning how the two rule documents relate to one another. The question has been probed by analyzing whether D or S might hold priority as a literary tradition one over the other. Arguments have been made in favour of both options, with reasons relating to redaction criticism and also to other literary observations.

The tradition of D has long been considered a parent tradition over S.21 For example, Charlotte Hempel finds evidence in the D manuscripts of later redaction work, the purpose of which is to “bring the communal legislation of the Laws into line with S.”22 Hempel argues that the reference in CD XV, 8 to “the many” (רבים) in “the overseer over the many” (מבקר הרבים) is a redaction to bring the passage further in line with numerous references to “the many” in 1QS, such as VI, 11-12, “the overseer over the many” (איש המבקר על הרבים). The argument rests on the idea that CD XV, 8 would have been originally simply “the overseer” or “the overseer over the camp” (מבקר על מחנה) as is found in CD XIII, 13, and was only changed subsequently to align with the later text of 1QS.23 Hempel specifically calls this type of redaction “Serekh redaction.”24 A “Serekh redaction” suggests that S is a secondary tradition which becomes incorporated into the D manuscripts, making D a parent text that developed an offshoot in S. Furthermore, this “Serekh redaction” demonstrates a close tie between the Damascus Document (D) texts and the specific “yahad” movement named in S.

21See the overview provided by Collins on the topic of a possible diachronic relationship between D and S (or S and D). Philip Davies, Charlotte Hempel, and John Collins are among those who preference D as a parent text to S. Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 5–6.
23Hempel, Laws, 81–85.
24Hempel, Laws, 83.
For literary reasons, S has also been considered a secondary work to D. Some have interpreted the Serek community to be a rift of individuals who left the Damascus group, led by a man of lies (CD XX, 14-15), who wanted a more rigorous rule.  

As a second theory, some favour instead the argument that the tradition of S precedes that of D. Evidence for this theory may also be drawn by means of literary dependence. For example, Reinhard Kratz has noted that the reference in 1QS VII, 12 to “Whoever walks naked before his fellow without being forced shall be punished (for) six months” (ואשר יהלך לפני רעהו ערום ולו הוה אנוש ונענש ששהחודשים), contains a literary addition in the D counterpart to this stipulation, 4Q266 Frag. 10, II, 9-10. This D counterpart reads as follows: “He who goes about [naked in the house] in the presence of his fellow, or out in the field in the presence [of people] 10 of p[eo]ple, shall be excluded for six [months]” (הו ערום לפני רחוב ידם בּית או בשדה הלך ערום לפני 10 [ב]עדרה ידם והובדל ששה חודשים). The D counterpart appears secondary because it adds further stipulations to the rule as it is found in S, by adding the specificity of locale for the violation and adding further specificity to the punishment.

Arguments in favour of S preceding D have been made by means other than redaction criticism and literary dependencies, too. For example, Eyal Regev argues in favour of the establishment of the group behind the Rule of the Community appearing first, because that rule text uses the term הרבים (“the many”) to describe members at a much higher frequency

25 John Collins and Eyel Regev offer overviews on the theory of a schism and those who have favoured such an argument (e.g. Gabriele Boccaccini; Philip Davies; Florentino García Martinez; Jerome Murphy O’Connor). Collins and Regev do not favour the argument, although for different reasons (see below). Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 48–50; Regev, Sectarianism, 192.
26 See the overview of Collins on the topic of the debate regarding a diachronic relationship between D and S. J. T. Milik, Eyel Regev, and Reinhard Kratz are among those scholars who preference S as a parent text to D. Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 5–6.
27 The final kaph in יהלך is actually erroneously written in medial form in 1QS.
than the *Damascus Document* does, and argues that the organization described by “the many” is more basic than the network of camps described in CD. Regev believes that the term became appropriated by the movement affiliated with D after it was first used in a more simplistic way by the earlier movement affiliated with S. In fact, Regev takes the extreme position that D is an “entirely different movement” from that of S.

The present study does not take such a radical view that D is an entirely different movement from S, considering the obvious literary linkages between the two rule texts. Even if S follows D, the existence of the two groups need not be due to a schism. Collins points out that since both rule texts continued to be copied from the later second through the first centuries B.C.E., and even into the early first century C.E. in the case of 4QD, it seems that both groups simply existed and grew in tandem. It may never be determined whether D or S came first, but for the purpose of the present study, whether the fact is one or the other does not matter. Critical instead is the point that both D and S advance simultaneously. A close study of the rule texts reveals that simultaneous progress of both traditions does indeed occur. Hempel refers to legislation concerning a “quorum of ten,” as observed in 1QS VI, 3, “And in every place where there are ten men” ( множה של עשרה אנשים), and CD XIII, 2b, “And where there are ten” ( מספר עשרה). Hempel believes the quorum of ten represents “a floating tradition that was incorporated into both D and S where it evolved in different ways.”

The common outcome from these theories is that clearly the D and S traditions are used and copied contemporaneously over the span of the Qumran movement.

---

30 The term הרבים occurs thirty-four times in 1QS, and “only four occurrences in CD and another five in all the Cave Four fragments that have no parallel in CD.” Regev, *Sectarianism*, 188.
32 Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 79.
33 The Charlesworth edition contains a *khet* rather than a *he* transcribed for עשרה.
For the present study, then, knowing that the D and S traditions progress contemporaneously and that evidence exists of either borrowing or drawing on common tradition, highlights the fact that there is an ongoing relationship between the two traditions, despite their differences. The Damascus and Serek traditions can both be qualified as subsets within the overarching classification of the “Qumran movement.” To know whether D or S was an earlier tradition could potentially highlight that changes toward the \( \text{gēr} \) within the movement take place due to changes in time. But, overall, scholarship on the matter is divided, and the present study does not aim to solve that question. And, even if one tradition were found to be earlier, because a contemporaneous movement is evidenced within both traditions and one does not become eclipsed by the other, implications regarding time frame between D and S seem minimal for the present study. Consequently the study observes the dating of relevant texts merely to ensure they fall within the time frame of the overall Qumran movement. In addition, to know that the two traditions of D and S progress contemporaneously permits any of the texts under consideration to date earlier or later within either the D or S traditions.

To summarize the implications of Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, the rule texts of the *Damascus Document* and *Rule of the Community* exist in multiple copies within the Qumran literary corpus, which suggests two dominant traditions within the Qumran movement. The prior chapter discerned that texts existing in multiple copies may suggest special importance. Other rule texts that exist in individual copies only, such as 1QSa and 4Q265, are not included in the present study, because it is difficult to establish their importance. Furthermore, the literary relationship between these two rule texts is complex, evidenced with simultaneous progression and borrowing between the two rules. Just as this literary situation is complex, so too are any potential social reconstructions within the movement. The present thesis, then, in performing this literary study of the \( \text{gēr} \) and literary delineation between D and S traditions, does not set out to address these social reconstructions, but rather approaches the material from this literary approach in the first step of the method.
2.2 Means of Establishing Provenance and Dating of the Texts

Establishing the provenance and dating of scriptural rewriting that employs the gēr within the DSS is based on three tools: identifying literary devices that include historical references, theological motifs, or particular terminology or wording; assessing styles of handwriting; and aligning texts within elements such as the particular orthography style associated with Qumran movement texts. Each tool has both positive and negative abilities to assess the provenance and dating of these texts. However, when the sum of their findings is added together, a more reliable whole may become clear.

2.2.1 Literary Devices: Historical References; Theological Motifs; Particular Terminology or Wording

Within the texts under consideration in the present study, some will contain historical references, such as to various monarchs and rulers, which can help to offer an earliest possible dating, or terminus post quem. Texts may also refer to certain theological motifs, such as an eschatological era, which may indirectly indicate historical clues. Different types of eschatologies may hint at different time periods. For example, George Brooke suggests that messianism that is specifically Davidic, such as what is seen throughout the second half of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, may represent a Qumranic literary output in response to the reign of Herod (37-4 B.C.E.), to “compensate for the earthly abuse of kingship” and instead extol “God as king.” However, a messianic expectation of the Davidic line may also be in response to “dissatisfaction with the kingship of the Hasmoneans, the heirs of the Maccabees,” according to John Collins. He suggests a first century B.C.E. dating, but because the Hasmonean era ended in 63 B.C.E., likely an earlier date than Herod is implied.

Finally, texts may utilize particular terminology or wording that links them together or links them to one of the rule traditions. However, literary devices alone may not be decisive, therefore dating and provenance must also be established by other means.

2.2.2 Paleography

Paleography, the study of handwriting for changes to a script over time and locale, is also used to discern provenance and dating. The present study draws on the well-known delineation of scribal periods as established by Frank Moore Cross. He identifies his three periods as the following: 1) Archaic, ca. 200-150 B.C.E.; 2) Hasmonean, ca. 150-30 B.C.E.; and 3) Herodian, ca. 30 B.C.E.-70 C.E. Concerning the breakdown of the Qumran manuscripts according to this typology, Cross concludes that “the vast majority of the MSS from Qumran fall into Periods 2 and 3, especially the latter half of Period 2, and the latter part of Period 3.” Based on this typology, most of the Qumran texts fall between 90 B.C.E. and 70 C.E. This method for dating the texts of Qumran has also been met with critique. Michael Wise argues that since not all of the Qumran documents’ locations of origin are known, one cannot properly take account of geographic differences. Such lacunas will inhibit the dating of scribal handwriting with any certainty. Wise argues that the typology of Cross used to assess dating of a text cannot apply to the DSS, because, for the time period of the scrolls, “we have no dated literary comparanda.” Furthermore, even if a paleographical date can be established for a text, it still only indicates the date at which the manuscript was copied, and not necessarily the actual date of composition.

2.2.3 Orthography Style

As noted at the outset of the chapter, a provenance for each text is also established, along with a proposed date of composition. A correlation of a text with either the D or S traditions...
is made by observing literary similarities. Of course, one must first assess the texts to see whether they correlate more generally with the Qumran movement at all. In addition to deducing provenance of the texts where the term gēr has been employed by general thematic means, orthographic markers are also used. In particular, what Emanuel Tov describes as a Qumran scribal practice is used frequently within DSS research. He has distilled the Qumran scrolls into two main groups of identifiable texts, one which contains particular orthography and grammatical forms such as plene spelling and a free textual approach, and one which lacks these particular forms and resembles the orthography of the MT, using a careful and conservative scribal approach. The texts with the particular orthography and freer approach are associated with the Qumran movement documents. Tov has concluded that the compositions deemed to stem from the movement “are written almost exclusively in the Qumran orthography and language.”^41 Tov suggests these scrolls need not only have been written on site at Qumran, but were most likely written elsewhere as well.^42 As with the preceding two techniques described to deduce provenance and dating, this third technique has also been met with criticism. Eibert Tigchelaar has proposed that “the variety between the manuscripts can better be described with the model of a spectrum, than in clear-cut categories . . . Tov’s “Qumran scribal practice” is such a cluster.”^43 Tov’s scribal practice may be described as a “cluster” but not necessarily a clear-cut indication of Qumran movement authorship.

Difficulties are noted within each of the various means described. However, a combination of overlapping clues from all three means of establishing dating and provenance can provide a more accurate result. With that in mind, the study now moves to this assessment of scriptural rewriting where the term gēr has been employed.

^43 Eibert Tigchelaar, “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice’,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 203.
2.3 An Assessment of the Occasions Where the Term גֶּר Has Been Employed

2.3.1 A Text That Precedes Damascus (D) and Serek (S) Traditions: 4Q423, 4QInstruction9 Frag. 5, 1-4

1[ the judgement of Korah. And as he opened your ear
2[to the mystery that is to come ] your . . . [ every he]ad of [your] fathers [ ] and leader of your people
3 he divided the [p]ortion of all rulers and fashioned every [dee]d by his hand, and the wages of
4[their deeds he knew. He will judg]e all of them in truth and visit upon fathers and sons,[
A textual reference to גֶּרֶם is located within 4QInstruction, a lengthy wisdom instructional work. Within Torleif Elgvin’s text and translation,44 while the gemel, resh, and yod have been reconstructed, Elgvin is still confident that it is לגֶּרֶם which would be present, due to the pairing with “every native born, lit. all natives” (כל אוריה), reminiscent of numerous

44Text and translation are those of Torleif Elgvin, located in DJD XXXIV. In a comparison between the transcription editions of Elgvin and Eibert Tigchelaar for the four lines of interest to this study, namely 4Q423 Frag. 5, 1-4, differences are fairly minimal. The study will not consider the superscript of line 1a, which in fact Tigchelaar, apart from the word פן (“lest”), describes as “barely legible.” The he of גֶּרֶם in line 2 of Elgvin’s transcript is not present in that of Tigchelaar. The word fragment קְפָה of line 2, Tigchelaar suggests could also read as קְפָה. Also in line 2, Elgvin reads גֶּרֶם לאבְתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא while Tigchelaar reads גֶּרֶם לאבְתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא אֲבָתַנָּא. In line 4, Elgvin reconstructs “their deeds he knew”, which Tigchelaar does not reconstruct. The grounds upon which Elgvin has made this reconstruction seem sound, as he draws on similar language from 1QS IV, 15-16 and 1QS IV, 25. Elgvin keeps the lamed within the reconstructed portion of קְפָה לאבְתַנָּא קְפָה לאבְתַנָּא קְפָה לאבְתַנָּא קְפָה לאבְתַנָּא, while Tigchelaar keeps the lamed without, קְפָה. Finally, it should be noted that for the sake of consistency between all text excerpts, Elgvin’s use of capitalization of the third person m. s. pronoun has been removed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction (STDJ 44; Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001), 142–3; Torleif Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction9,” in Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Musar le Mevin): 4Q415ff. (by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, in collaboration with Joseph A. Fitzmeyer; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 518–21.
scriptural predecessors. The clear presence of the final mem furthermore assists in the reading of gērîm, as it establishes that the “thing” to be paired with the natives is also in the masculine plural form. The m. pl. term gērîm is the natural pairing.

A dating for the original composition of 4QInstruction itself is a more difficult matter, and numerous dates have been proposed. As for the manuscript itself, 4QInstr\[46\] 4Q423 is written in a middle or late Herodian script and thus likely dates to the early first century C.E., even though this late time frame will not be upheld for the work as a whole.\[46\] 4Q423 Frag. 5, 2 refers to “[every he]ad of [your] fathers [ ] and leader of your people” (ר\[47\]האבות ואזכאות and ונשיא עMahon). Elgvin suggests that these leaders are “the contemporary leaders of Israel who do not share the secrets of God’s mysteries, and who will be judged by God along with all others.”\[47\] He hypothesizes that this contemporary period may, in fact, be the Hasmonean era (164-63 B.C.E.) and the leaders may thus be Hasmonean leaders. Elgvin considers the Hasmonean era to be likely for the dating of 4QInstruction because he argues that the eschatological message of the text is apocalyptic and not restorative, “which indicates a distance from the Maccabean-Hasmonaean establishment.”\[48\] Within this hypothesis, then, the authors of 4QInstruction would be advocating an end-time as they perceive no hopeful outcome under the contemporary Maccabean establishment. An opposing view has been forwarded by Matthew Goff, who concludes that 4QInstruction was not written contemporaneously with the Hasmonean era. Instead, he argues for a date of composition preceding the Maccabean revolt, thus in the early second century B.C.E. (i.e., prior to the initial revolt of 167 B.C.E.).\[49\] Goff does not believe that the text refers to the mainstream cult or Temple as being in jeopardy. He proposes a second option as well, which would be a

\[47\]Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction\#,” 519.
\[48\]Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction\#,” 520, n. 33.
\[49\]Matthew J. Goff, Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (VTSup 116; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 66.
first century B.C.E. dating for the text, “when this [Hasmonean] crisis was no longer of immediate interest.”

Of these various propositions, a second century dating in roughly the first half of the Hasmonean era seems likely, because 4QInstruction definitely shows signs of sectarianism. Out of 4QInstruction’s repeated use of the phrase רז נהיה, “the mystery that is to come,” John Ashton makes the keen observation that any group that attaches special importance to an extra revelation above and beyond the Law, such as the רז נהיה, is properly speaking sectarian, because it thereby diverges from those whom we may call, with some hesitation, the representatives of mainstream Judaism.

Sectarianism began to flourish in response to the Maccabean Revolt and the Hasmonean period from 164/3 B.C.E., according to Albert Baumgarten. This data contradicts Goff’s theory, which argues for either a pre- or post- Maccabean date, and instead confirms Elgvin’s findings of a second century B.C.E. time frame in response to the founding of the Hasmonaean era.

The “sectarian” nature described provides a segue into the matter of 4QInstruction’s provenance. While 4QInstruction may convey a sectarian character, the combined results of Elgvin and Goff suggest the work precedes the Qumran movement and is not necessarily a direct predecessor, although textual similarities may be found. Elgvin suggests that the “use of רז נהיה in a non-sectarian sense in this text may indicate that 4QInstruction derives from a period before sectarian terminology had become stereotyped.” Such a statement implies

50 Goff, Discerning Wisdom, 66.
51 John Ashton, “‘Mystery’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel,” in John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate (ed. Mary L Coloe and Tom Thatcher; SBLEJL 32; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 59.
53 Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction,” 520. Elgvin lists numerous examples in texts correlated with the Qumran movement whereby he writes that רז נהיה designates an eschatological leader of the community.” (See, for example, CD VII, 20; 4Q266 Fr. 3, III, 21; 4Q269 Fr. 5, 4; 1QM III, 16; and V, 1.) To reiterate, Elgvin believes the רז נהיה of 4QInstruction represents contemporary leaders (possibly Hasmonean) and not an eschatological prince.
that the text may fall into a category of “pre-Qumran movement.” Goff concludes that “no citation of 4QInstruction is evident in the yahad literature, with the possible exception of the text common to 1QH 18 and 4Q418 55.” Even though Elgvin claims a similar attitude toward the gēr of 4Q423 and also that of CD XIV, 4, namely that “proselytes will be judged by God along with the native Israelites,” the “similarity” is vague, since the gēr is found among Israelites in texts correlated with both D and S. There is no singular resemblance between 4Q423 and either D or S, or texts correlated with those traditions.

In sum, regarding the provenance and dating of 4QInstruction, the text appears to precede the Qumran movement and yet contains sectarian notions within a likely Hasmonean second century B.C.E. time frame. No direct lineage to the rule traditions of S or D may be established.

2.3.2 Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition

2.3.2.1 Damascus Document Manuscripts: Cairo Genizah and 4QD

Broadly speaking, the Cairo Genizah CD work consists of two manuscripts, A and B, the contents of which can be organized as Laws (CD IX-XVI) and Admonition (CD I-VIII; XIX-XX). Charlotte Hempel has suggested that the Admonition has a “sectarian character,” whose purpose is to “guide the readers as to the way in which one should read these Laws.” Hempel suggests that the Laws, distinguished in the strata of Halakah, Community Organization, Miscellaneous Halakah, and Miscellaneous Traditions and Redactional Material, are overall “not a sectarian composition.” Nevertheless, Hempel argues that more redactional activity has occurred within the communal legislation portion of the Laws,

54Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 65, n. 218.
suggesting Qumran movement activity within this strata. Cairo Genizah manuscript text A, which encompasses the CD passages of interest VI, 14-VII, 1, which is part of the identified sectarian Admonition, and also XIV, 3-6, which falls into the redacted Community Organization stratum of the Laws, has been dated to the 10th century C.E.\textsuperscript{60} Of the total eight 4QD manuscripts analyzed by Joseph Baumgarten and Jozef Milik,\textsuperscript{61} the present study of the \textit{gēr} will bring to the fore 4Q266, 4Q267, 4Q268, and 4Q269. Obviously, these texts correlate with D and the D tradition, since they are a part of that same rule text. Thus the following sections regarding CD VI-VII and CD XIV will be spent primarily confirming that the fragmentary 4QD texts match with those of CD,\textsuperscript{62} in order to ensure the presence of the term \textit{gēr} within these manuscripts found at Qumran.

\textsuperscript{60}Schechter, \textit{Jewish Sectaries}, 9. Schechter makes this suggestion due to paleography.
\textsuperscript{62}To reiterate, readings from CD are taken from Charlesworth, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls Vol. 2}. 
2.3.2.1.1 CD VI, 14-VII, 1

14 . . . unless they take care to perform according to the exact (requirements of) the Torah during the time of evil and to separate (themselves)
15 from the sons of the pit and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) impure due to oath(s) and dedication(s)
16 and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people, preying upon wid[ow]s
17 and murdering orphans – and to distinguish between the impure and the pure and make known (the difference) between
18 the holy and the profane, and to observe the Sabbath day in its exact detail, and the appointed times
19 and the day of the fast as it was found by those who entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus,
20 to offer up the holy things in accordance with their detailed requirements, to love each man his brother
21 as himself, to support the poor, destitute, and gēr; vacat and to seek each man the peace VII, 1 of his brother.

The first passage under consideration, CD VI, 14-VII, 1, finds parallels in 4Q266 Frag. 3, II, 19-Frag. 3, III, 2 (parallel to CD VI, 14-VII, 1), as well as 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 1-5 (parallel to CD VI, 19-VII, 1). It is in CD VI, 21 specifically that one finds the first reference to the gēr, listed within a series of stipulations that outline “the exact (requirements of) the Torah” for members to follow. To reiterate, this chapter’s analysis of CD concerns itself with any variants of possible significance in the interpretation of the gēr between CD and the overlapping 4QD fragments. Of primary concern is the fact that the textual location of the term gēr of CD VI, 21 is damaged and not extant in the matching fragment.

63 Only the portions of these fragments that overlap CD VI, 14-VII, 1 are cited. In full, 4Q266 Frag. 3, II parallels CD V, 13-VI, 20; Frag. 3, III parallels CD VI, 20-21, VII, 4-5, and 17-VIII, 3; and 4Q269 Frag. 4, II parallels CD VI, 19-VII, 3.
However, the overlap between the existing text in the 4Q fragments (4Q266 and 4Q269) and the text of CD shows that the majority of textual variants relate to minor orthographic or grammatical differences. For example, a variant within Frag. 3, III includes באים כולם (lit. “all those who come”) in line 24, as opposed to the reading in CD VIII, 1 which exhibits plene spelling and the construct form כל ביאר.64 These changes are minor and do not constitute a change in meaning. Therefore the present study is confident in the conclusions of Milik and Baumgarten in DJD XVIII, that the term is present in 4QD as in CD VI, 21.

Concerning 4Q266, Frag. 3, III, 1-2, which is the parallel to CD VI, 20-21, the lines have been fully reconstructed. Curiously, the DJD reconstructs רעהו (“his friend”) instead of אחיהו (“his brother”), as in CD VI, 20. However, since the DJD English translation in fact shows “his brother,”65 matching with CD, this discrepancy is likely an error within the DJD volume. Regarding the dating of 4Q266, Baumgarten concludes that “the idiosyncratic semi-cursive handwriting of 4Q266 should be dated to the first half or to the middle of the first century BCE.”66

Concerning 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 1-5 which parallels CD VI, 19-VII, 1 and thus overlaps with the reference to the gēr of CD VI, 21, some text remains even though the reference to the gēr is reconstructed. Within the remaining text, the variants appear as either scribal error or minor grammatical variant. In CD VI, 21 where it reads הָלַחֲמוֹת בְּרֵי אָבוֹת וּגֶר (“to support the poor, destitute, and gēr”), Milik’s transcription, in 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 3, shows בֶּלֶּשֶׁת (lit. “as far as” with a bet prefix, likely a bet of specification), instead of the בֶּרֶד (“the hand”) present in CD VI, 21. Second, in CD VI, 21-VII, 1 where one reads וַדִּרְשׁוּ אֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר שָׁלוֹם אַחֵיהוּ (“and to seek each man the peace of his brother”), Milik’s transcription in 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 4, shows בֶּשֶׁלֶת אֵשׁ אַחֵיהוּ (“the peace of his brother”), with a bet of specification and

64 Joseph M. Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4: XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273), 45.
65 Joseph M. Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4: XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273), 44.
definiteness shown only by means of the pronominal suffix present in the absolute of the
construct phrase. This marker of definiteness differs from that of CD VI, 21, (“the peace of his brother”), with definiteness indicated by the definite direct object marker.

These variants altogether are minor. The present study concurs with Milik and Baumgarten that the term \textit{gēr} is present in 4Q269, as it is in CD VI, 21, despite the corrupted manuscript evidence at the location where one would expect to find the term. With regard to dating of the 4Q269 manuscript, Baumgarten observes that the manuscript “exhibits an early Herodian formal hand” and thus has a dating in the late first century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{67}

\subsection*{2.3.2.1.2 CD XIV, 3-6}

3 The rule for the assembly of all the camps: They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the \textit{gēr} fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names, one after the other [lit. each one after his brother], the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the \textit{gēr} fourth.\textsuperscript{68}

The second CD passage under consideration is the excerpt CD XIV, 3-6. This passage is a part of the Community Organization strata of the Laws, which is the section that appears to have undergone a certain amount of editing by the Qumran movement.\textsuperscript{69} CD XIV, 3-6, which describes the hierarchical enlistment and inscription of “the rule for the assembly of all the camps” ( нескור מושב כל המנחת), lists the \textit{gēr} twice. The hierarchical listing of the assembly

\begin{itemize}
\item 3 The rule for the assembly of all the camps: They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first,
\item 4 the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the \textit{gēr} fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names,
\item 5 one after the other [lit. each one after his brother], the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the \textit{gēr} fourth.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{68}For reasons of consistency, a translation of “assembly” has been selected instead of that of “settlement,” used in the Charlesworth edition for the word \textit{מושב}.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{69}For example, Hempel considers that “,הרבים of 4Q266, Frag. 10, II, 6b-7 has been added secondarily, to bring the Laws of the \textit{Damascus Document} into alignment with 1QS. Hempel, \textit{Laws}, 81–85. See also the present chapter p. 59.
members in CD XIV, 5-6 is identical to its first appearance in lines 3-4. 4Q267 Frag. 9, V, 6-11 overlaps with this entire passage, while 4Q268 Frag. 2, 1-2 overlaps with CD XIV, 5-6.70

A point of concern is that 4Q267 Frag. 9, V, 7-8 omits the first of the two references to the gēr from the hierarchical listing. Instead of the listing identified in CD XIV, 3-4 of “the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the gēr fourth” (כוהנים לָשּׁוֹנָהוּ וְלֹא־יָד וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְשֵׁשַׁתָּם הֹגֵר רביעי), one finds “the priests first, the Levites] second, and the Israelites [th]ird” (כהנים לוהים [כהנים וירא ז сто וברות ). However, the gēr is cited in 4Q267 Frag. 9, V, 10, which parallels the second listing of the term in CD XIV, 6. Most likely the 4Q267 scribe accidentally omitted the first gēr reference.71 The second key point to note concerning the 4Q267 fragment is that the term gēr is actually present in the extant manuscript fragment. Baumgarten categorizes the 4Q267 manuscript, like 4Q269, as an “early Herodian formal hand.”72

4Q268 Frag. 2, paralleling CD XIV, 5-6, is reconstructed identically to 4Q267 Frag. 9, V, 8-10. Of the specific hierarchical list in question, only the word הולויים remains, with the rest being reconstructed. Paleographical dating suggests a dating of the manuscript fragment in the early first century C.E.73

To summarize, the Damascus Document is a foundational rule text to the Qumran movement, whose formation occurred as early as the late second century B.C.E. and flourished within the first century B.C.E. The manuscripts of interest within the present study date anywhere from the first half of the first century B.C.E. until the early first century

70In their entirety, 4Q267 Frag. 9, V, parallels with CD XIII, 22-XIV, 10; 4Q268 Frag. 2 parallels CD XIV, 5-6.
71David Hamidović, who hypothesizes that the missing first usage of the term could imply either a gēr’s nonintegration into the Qumran movement’s “future project” or assimilation of gērin with Israelites, concludes that it is still simplest to suppose a copy error. In this regard, his conclusion matches that of Hempel. Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 283; Hempel, Laws, 135.
73Joseph M. Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4: XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273), 118.
C.E. The textual inclusion of the *gēr* with regard to CD VI, 21 and CD XIV, 3 and 6 has been confirmed.

### 2.3.2.2 11QT<sup>a</sup>, *11Q Temple Scroll*, XL, 5-6

The passage wherein the term *gēr* has been employed is located in *TS 11QT<sup>a</sup> XL, 5-6, with line 5 being the point at which regulations concerning a third Temple court commence. Yigael Yadin observes that this column “is one of those that were found in extremely poor condition.” The present work will supplement Yadin’s edition with Elisha Qimron’s subsequent 1996 critical edition of the text in which Qimron offers a greater amount of reproduced text. Yadin’s earlier version does not suggest Qimron’s reconstruction of סובבת את החצר התיכונה (“surround the central courtyard”), nor his reading of בירתא (“in Israel”). Presumably Qimron deduces the central courtyard reconstruction from the similar phraseology of line 7 ("[until the third generation] vacat wi]de around the central court six hundred cubits"), and considers it to mean the third courtyard under discussion. All text reconstructions clearly read וולגרים (“and for *gērîm*”) and consequently there is no doubt concerning the presence of the *gēr* to be included in the third courtyard of *TS*’s ideal Temple.

---

76 Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*. The present study uses the base Hebrew text and English translation provided by Yadin, supplemented or supplanted (when an alternate is provided) with the expansive reconstructions to the Hebrew by Qimron. English translation of Qimron’s reconstructions is offered by the present study.
What can be said with regard to the dating of the TS? The work exists in two firm manuscripts, 11QTA (11QT19) and 11QTB (11QT20), and possibly also the small fragment 11QTC (11QT21).\textsuperscript{77} Despite the fact that all three manuscripts of 11QTA, 11QTB and 11QTC date from the Herodian period, scholarship dates the composition of TS to the Hasmonean period, primarily due to the written content.\textsuperscript{78} TS opens with a retelling of the Sinaitic covenant renewal and tabernacle building of Exodus 34 and 35, followed by the Temple plan and related laws, the Laws of the King, and finally a rewriting a Deuteronomy 18-22.\textsuperscript{79} Lawrence Schiffman observes that the Laws of the King represent TS’s “most sustained example of original composition,” which suggests that clues to the contemporary period may lie within certain monarchic stipulations.\textsuperscript{80}

Both Yadin and Schiffman find the section dedicated to the Laws of the King (found within 11QTA LVI, 12-LIX, 21) best suited to the Hasmonean King John Hyrcanus I, who

\textsuperscript{77}While 11Q21 deals with matters of the Temple and Jerusalem, similar to 11Q19 and 11Q20, because overlaps with the rest of TS are somewhat limited, it is not possible to conclusively establish the exact relationship between 11Q21 and TS. For example, 11Q21 could be a different version of TS, or could perhaps be a source for TS, but not necessarily a copy of the TS “as witnessed by the manuscript tradition of 11Q19 and 11Q20.” See James H. Charlesworth and Andrew D. Gross, “Temple Scroll-Like Document,” in Temple Scroll and Related Documents (ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 7 of The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations; PTS/SSP; Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 227–33, citation from 228.

\textsuperscript{78}Yigael Yadin originally thought that both Rockefeller 43.975 and also Rockefeller 43.366 were additional fragments from TS manuscripts. While 43.975 was indeed affirmed as TS and subsequently identified as 11QTA, 43.366 was later discerned to be a Reworked Pentateuch (4Q365a). This detail is important because it leaves both of these two major manuscript samples dating to the Herodian period, and none actually dating to the Hasmonean period, which was the case with 4Q365a. The work of both scribes identified in 11Q19, Scribe A responsible for columns I-V and Scribe B responsible for VI-LXVII, date to the Herodian period. 11Q21 also makes use of a later Herodian formal script. See all of the following: Qimron, The Temple Scroll, 1, 4–5; Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll and the Nature of Its Law: The Status of the Question,” in The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 40–42; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 17, 386; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2, 11, 18; Charlesworth and Gross, “Temple Scroll-Like Document,” 227.

\textsuperscript{79}Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 42–43; Yadin describes the themes of TS more generally in a tri-fold fashion as the “plan of the Temple,” the “Statues of the King,” and “the laws assembled in Deuteronomy.” Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 387.

\textsuperscript{80}Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 49.
reigned between 134-104 B.C.E. Yadin suggests that certain regulations written in TS (beyond solely the Laws of the King) influenced Hyrcanus to change his regulations to be in accordance with those of TS. Yadin explains that the author of TS “generally deals with commands and subjects that ran contrary to contemporary practice.” Thus, Yadin believes that 11QTa XXXIV’s regulations concerning the use of rings to fasten animals in Temple slaughter subsequently influenced John Hyrcanus to adopt the practice, a practice which Yadin notes is “attested by the codified rabbinic laws.” In a similar vein, Schiffman describes TS as “a polemic against the existing order, calling for radical change in the order of the day, putting forward reforms in areas of cultic, religious and political life.” To demonstrate that this polemic reacts against the monarch Hyrcanus and not another, Schiffman notes that TS argues against the use of mercenaries, which were “used extensively by John Hyrcanus.” In order for the scroll to concern itself not only with current practices of Hyrcanus but also influence his future practices, Schiffman suggests that perhaps TS was written no earlier than the second half of Hyrcanus’ reign, meaning roughly between 119-104 B.C.E.

Now that the dating of TS has been roughly established to be somewhere between 119 and 104 B.C.E., what can be said regarding the provenance of this document? Yadin observes that TS is similar to stipulations in CD, such as the regulation prohibiting sexual intercourse within the Temple city. Each regulation approaches the topic from a slightly

---

81While Yadin suggests that TS could possibly date also to the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.), he prefers John Hyrcanus as the identified king. Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 386. Other scholars have suggested Alexander Jannaeus as the king in question, and have even suggested a king as late as Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.E.). Barbara Thiering, “The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll,” in Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987 (ed. George J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 104–6. Considering the relationship between TS and CD that will be discussed shortly, the choice of Herod as the king in question seems far too late.
82Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 388.
83Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 388.
84Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 51.
85Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 49.
86Lawrence Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 49.
87Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 398.
different angle, however. CD XII, 1-2 regulates to “Let no man lie with a woman in the city of the sanctuary to defile 2 the city of the sanctuary with their pollution” (אל ישכב איש עם אשה את עיר המקדש בנדתם את עיר המקדש בנדתם), while 11QTa XLV, 11-12 expresses the matter from a somewhat more indirect fashion: “And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not come into any part of the city 12 of the temple, where I will settle my name, for three days” (ואיש כי ישכב עם אשתו שכבת זרע לא יבוא אל כל שלושת ימים). Does this thematic connection imply that TS correlates with the Qumran movement that lies behind D? Schiffman notes that Tov correlates 11QTa with the unique features of Qumran scribal practice, features such as *plene* spelling and a relaxed scribal style.\(^{88}\) However, the two examples between TS and CD concerning prohibition against Temple city sexual intercourse, while they share a literary theme, do not demonstrate a specific literary dependence.\(^{89}\) Nevertheless, some sort of obvious connection exists between the D tradition and TS.

Because it is now established that the *Damascus Document*, as a foundational work of the Qumran movement, originates from the late second or early first century B.C.E., and TS to 119-104 B.C.E., the latter document’s genesis could be described as “correlated with formative D.” TS does not appear to align with S.

---


\(^{89}\) Schiffman has noted, concerning other texts, that shared themes do not necessarily indicate literary dependence. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; SBLSS 2; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 97.
4QApocryphal Pentateuch B 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 6 is the present study’s primary line of interest in this text which has been most frequently studied to analyze its retelling of the Sinai and Horeb theophany narratives. Even though a key portion of the phrase, namely לְאֵישׁ אָב לְאֵישׁ בִּין הָאָב (between a father and his son, and between a man and [his] gēr”), shows some uncertainty in the letters, one can be confident that James VanderKam and Monica Brady

---

90 Studies have primarily attempted to determine the nature of Moses in the text. The general consensus is that within the 4Q377 rewritten Sinai and Horeb narratives, Moses is a unique messenger of God who appears like an angel, and yet is not an actual angel. For example, Emile Puech argues that Moses is “like an angel who speaks from the very mouth of God, but he is not an angel” (translation mine). See Emile Puech, “Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377, Pentateuque Apocryphe B: L’Exaltation de Moïse,” RevQ 21, no. 3 (2004): 469–75, esp. 474. Ariel Feldman suggests that it is Moses’ role at Sinai and his uniqueness as God’s messenger which is emphasized in 4Q377. Ariel Feldman, “The Sinai Revelation According to 4Q377 (Apocryphal Pentateuch B),” DSD 18 (2011): 155–72, esp. 170. Wido van Peursen argues that within the retelling of the Sinai and Horeb narrative, the main issue at stake is that of observing the commandments. Wido van Peursen, “Who Was Standing on the Mountain? The Portrait of Moses in 4Q377,” in Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions (ed. Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter; BZAW 372; Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007), 99–113, 100-101, 111.
have reconstructed the text accurately and the gēr exists in this passage.\(^{91}\) According to VanderKam and Brady:

To the left of lamed in לבנו only traces of letters remain but they are consistent with ובנו which the context suggests. The context also favours reading the next word as ובין. The last visible word, where one might have expected לאה, has traces of a lamed but the next letter does not resemble an alep. Rather, its inverted ‘v’-shape indicates a gimel (so Strugnell). Also, the next letter is not a sin, only a vertical stroke from the right side of the letter remains.\(^{92}\)

The present study concurs that the inverted “v” base of the gimel is clearly present and looks similar to that of the gimel of חגי of line 5.\(^{93}\) In addition, while the vertical stroke of the lamed of the proposed לגרו is missing, the horizontal line and hook are somewhat evident and look similar, albeit smaller, than the clear לאה earlier in the same line. Overall one can confirm that this line encompasses the parallel structure of judging between a man and his friend, a father and his son, and a man and his gēr.

While such a phraseology in its entirety is new, numerous similar passages exist, one of which ultimately determines a provenance for the work. The passages include Exod 18:16 “and I judge between a man and his friend” (וַיִּשְׁפָּהוּ בַּיִת עַזֶּה רֵעַהוּ); Num 30:17 “between a man to his wife; between a father to his daughter” (בּתֹו לְאֵבָו בֵּין־שִׁוִּי אֵלָי לְבֵינָּהוּ); Deut 1:16 “between a man, his brother, and his gēr” (בּית אֱלָי לְאֵבָו בֵּין־שִׁוִּי אֵלָי לְבֵינָּהוּ); and also Jer 7:5 “between a man and his friend” (וַיַּשְׁפָּהוּ בַּיִת עַזֶּה רֵעַהוּ).\(^{94}\) 4Q377 Frag. 2, II, 6-7 contains the similarly-phrased יֵרֵד אִשׁ וּרְעָתוֹ (“a man will speak with his friend”), suggestive of Exod 33:11.\(^{95}\)

To this list of resembling passages one may add CD VII, 8-9, which inserts a citation of Num 30:17 and the repeating הבן pattern. Thus 4Q377 correlates closely with D, due in part to this

---


\(^{92}\)VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII.* Miscellanea, Part 2, 209.

\(^{93}\)Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q377 at the Scullery in person in August 2012. I am particularly indebted to the IAA because they took the multispectral photos of 4Q377, as a part of the scrolls digitization project, especially for my work with this fragment.

\(^{94}\)VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII.* Miscellanea, Part 2, 210.

\(^{95}\)VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII.* Miscellanea, Part 2, 215; Puech, “Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377,” 369.
repeated refrain of “between Person X and Person Y.” Furthermore, the familial reference in 4Q377 to a man and his son is more reminiscent of the family-style living arrangement observed in D, than the absence of family references observed in S. Finally, VanderKam and Brady note that the spelling in 4Q377 is the same plene spelling used in “many Qumran texts.” This information regarding full spelling suggests the Qumran orthography system as described by Tov, also linking the document with the Qumran movement.

Concerning dating, VanderKam and Brady conclude, based on the shapes of the letters, that “the script is a formal one from the Hasmonaean period, to be dated to 100-50 BCE, with a date earlier in this fifty-year period more likely.” The dating of the text based on the lettering also suggests that the text is composed, or at least transcribed, near the height of the movement’s life span.

---

96 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea*, Part 2, 206.
97 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea*, Part 2, 206.
2.3.2.4 4Q159, 4QOrdinances Frags. 2-4, 1-3

1 And if . . . to a] gēr or the offspring of the fami[y of a gēr . . . ]
2 in the presence of Isr[ael.] They [may no]t serve non-Jews. With a zr[ . . . ]
3 Egypt and he commanded them not to be sold in a transaction of slavery.

The present occasion where the term gēr has been employed relies on the transcription and translation of Lawrence Schiffman. Despite the transcription and translation in 4QOrd, 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1, “And if . . . to a] gēr or to the offspring of the fami[y of a gēr . . . ]” (וּמֵא יִתְנַשְׁכֵּר עַזָּר גַּּר אוּלְּעִמּוֹ הָאָבִּיר), no reference to a gēr in 4Q159 is to be found in Martin Abegg’s DSS concordance. This absence is due to the fact that John Allegro’s original reconstruction of the text of Frags. 2-4, 1 is “And if . . . they cut off the guardian of a family . . . ” (הַלֵּוֵי וַהַגֶּרֶת וַהַימָּלֶת וַהַימָּלֶת). Strugnell and Yadin subsequently suggested

88It has been proposed by Francis Weinert, and reconsidered by both Katell Berthelot and David Hamidović, to reconstruct 4Q159 Frag. 1, II, 3 by inserting the figures of “the Levite, and the gēr, and the orphan, and the widow” (הָלְוֵי וְהַגֶּרֶת וַהָיתִים וַאֶלֶם). Such a reconstruction borrows phraseology from Num 18:30 and Deut 14:29. The rationale is that the following line refers to “whoever in Israel owns nothing, that person can eat some and gather for himself” (line 4), and passages such as this one that involve gleaning generally include the gēr, as seen in Lev 19:9-10; 23:22; and Deut 24:19-22. However, there is no way to know that any or all four entities should be listed as those who can glean, since the passage is not borrowed closely enough from any one source. And, since there are no other manuscripts of 4Q159 against which to compare, unlike the gēr between the CD and the 4QD fragments, this hypothetical reconstruction cannot be verified. Thus the present study proposes only one gēr occurrence for 4Q159, namely that of Frags. 2-4 which is discussed in this section. Francis Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation for an Essene Community Outside of Qumran?” JSJ 5, no. 2 (1974): 190; Berthelot, “La Notion de גֶּר,” 180–1; Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 269–70.


100Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules”.


the current reconstruction that would correspond to a likeness with Lev 25:47. Yadin is the first to suggest this reading, in 1968, seeing that “some of the ‘Ordinances’ in the following lines are related to Lev. 25:35 ff.” In Strugnell’s reconstruction from 1970, he comments that reading line 1 as העקר instead of the Lev 25:47 rendering of העקר is simply “one of the numerous cases in which the qutl is attested at Qumran while the Masoretic Hebrew has a qitl.” It is now evident that 1) the passage clearly refers to a gēr; 2) the passage reformats Lev 25:47-55; and 3) both items 1 and 2 have become the general scholarly consensus.

The above comment concerning qutl morphology denotes a connection to the plene spelling exhibited by the Qumran movement. What further can be argued regarding the provenance of 4Q159? The nature of the ordinances themselves provide clues. Ordinances from a variety of works have been rewritten in 4Q159. Frags. 2-4 contain four different legislative matters: lines 1-3 are the adaptation of Lev 25:47-55 and manumission regulations; lines 3-6 discuss the size of the movement’s regulatory council and their judgment system in accordance with Deut 17:8-13; lines 6-7 concern prohibitions regarding wearing clothing of the opposite sex in accordance with Deut 22:5; and lines 8-10 regulate a case of a man challenging his new wife’s virginity, in accordance with Deut 22:13-21.

Schiffman aptly notes that there is “no organizing principle” in 4Q159, and concludes that this collection of assorted regulations is different from Jewish law found in the Mishnah. Consequently, this conclusion implies that the authors of 4Q159 are not Pharisaic, the sectarian group most frequently affiliated as “ancestors” to the rabbis and the Mishnah as a

103 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 197. In n. 50, Weinert comments that the change in reading to line 1 made by Yadin and Strugnell “greatly improves the sense of this line.”
rabbinic work. Instead, Allegro concludes that the document is representative of a “piece of Essene life and attitude to the Temple tribute” and contains relevance to “Essenism at large as well as to the peculiar circumstances of the monastic community at Qumran.”

Even though the present study has already argued against affiliating the Qumran movement to the Essenes specifically as does Allegro, do the authors of 4Q159 belong to the Qumran movement and either the D or S traditions? Weinert points out that the nature of certain legislations among those found within Frags. 2-4 seem an unlikely fit for regulations existing at the actual site of Qumran. For example, why include a regulation concerning women when archaeological evidence suggests scant presence of women on the Qumran site? The evidence leads Weinert to conclude that 4Q159 should be cast “in a light similar to that of the Damascus Document which, although it manifests clear affinities with Qumran belief and was preserved there, gives evidence that its origin was in a different life situation than that at Qumran proper.” This statement implies an affinity with the D tradition, which, as has been previously noted, describes life in camps and cities and legislates concerning women. While nothing precludes members affiliated with the S tradition from living in satellite groups, S does not legislate concerning women, making S an unlikely liaison to 4Q159.

Finally, when was 4Q159 composed? It is feasible that 4Q159 was composed sometime during the height of the D tradition in the mid-first century B.C.E. A date in the late first century B.C.E. has been suggested for the manuscript itself, based on the

111 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 205.
112 Magness, Archaeology of Qumran, 163–87. Magness concludes that a disproportionately small number of adult female skeletons found at the Qumran site, and the “complete absence of infants and children among the excavated burials in the western sector,” are both suggestive that “the community at Qumran did not include families,” 173.
113 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 206.
114 See Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 58, 65–69.
document’s use of an early Herodian formal script. Based on the Herodian script, the present study situates this text between *4QpNah* 4Q169, which has a *terminus post quem* of 63 B.C.E., and *4QFlor* 4Q174, which dates to the later first century B.C.E. Allegro suggests that what becomes identified as 4Q159 has, in fact, “a beautifully shaped and proportioned book hand, bearing a marked resemblance, if not identical, with that of 4QFlorilegium.” A date for a text can only be given within observable limits, and the limits of this knowledge where 4Q159 is concerned suggest a date in the second half of the first century B.C.E.

2.3.2.5 *4Q279, 4QFour Lots*, Frag. 5, 1-6

1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7 [ ]

1 [ ] his fellow who is inscribed after [ him ]
2 [ ] his [fell]ow who is inscribed after [ hi
3 [ ] his [ ], and greatness of pedigree (is) upon him, and th[u]s [ ]
4 [ ] And for the pri[e]sts, the sons of Aaron, shall go out the [first] lot [ ]
5 [ ] a man according to his spirit. And the [second] lot [t ]
6 [ ] the fourth lot for the *gēr[îm]*

*4QFour Lots* 4Q279 is named after the very reference within Fragment 5 to four lots which will be distributed to various parties, of which the fourth lot [גרל] will go out to the *gērîm*. As for the word *gērîm* itself in Frag. 5, 6, despite the fact that Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes observe that “the trace of the *reš* before the lacuna is very faint,” the *lamed* and *gimel* of the noun are clearly visible. The presence of the *gēr* in this passage is assured.

--------------------

116 See the present chapter’s sections on these two texts.
While the only other recipients of a lot for which manuscript evidence exists are “the priests, the sons of Aaron” (יִהְיֶה חֲלָצֵי בֵּית אָהֳרֹן), it is fairly certain that two other recipients will be the Levites and the children of Israel. This deduction is derived from the parallel listing within CD XIV 3-6 of the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the gēr fourth.\textsuperscript{119} The passage describing the lot distribution in 4Q279 is found within lines 4-6, although some discrepancy exists between scholarly reconstructions. Alexander and Vermes, in their reconstruction, place a second lot after איש לפי רוח of line 5. In contrast, Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar reconstruct only the third lot after איש לפי רוחו.\textsuperscript{120} Nevertheless, while García Martínez and Tigchelaar do not actually reconstruct the second lot within line 4, the rest of their reconstruction suggests an agreement with Alexander and Vermes that the passage is following a similar hierarchical ordering as what is found in CD XIV.\textsuperscript{121}

Thematic and paleographic clues assist in the dating of 4Q279. The “lot” is a word common to the Qumran scrolls, appearing, for example, in 1QS II, 2; II, 4-5; 1QM I, 5; and XIII, 5.\textsuperscript{122} In the scrolls pertaining to the Qumran movement, Alexander, Vermes and others suggest that the term denotes a predestined figurative apportioning of “light” to an individual or a group, as opposed to the term’s majority scriptural sense of the apportioning of a “lot” of land.\textsuperscript{123} Alexander and Vermes conclude that the reference to lots in 4Q279 “is probably eschatological, the ‘lots’ being the rewards that will be meted out to the four named groups in

\textsuperscript{119}Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 221.
\textsuperscript{121}David Hamidović also considers that second and third lots would likely belong to Levites and children of Israel in this passage, based on the hierarchy already identified in CD XIV, 3-6, as well as 1QS II, 19-23’s hierarchical listing of priests first, Levites second, “then all the people” (וכול העם) third. David Hamidović, “4Q279, 4QFour Lots, une interprétation du Psalme 135 appartenant à 4Q421, 4QWays of Righteousness,” \textit{DSD} 9, no. 2 (2002): 172–73.
\textsuperscript{122}Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 222. The lot appears within D as well, for example CD XIII, 12.
\textsuperscript{123}Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 222. Hamidović suggests that “[t]he quality of the spirit, meaning the proportion of light in the spirit received at birth, determines all the hierarchy.” Hamidović, “4Q279, 4QFour Lots,” 172. Gerhard von Rad lists numerous examples of גָּוָל within the Pentateuch, as well as Joshua and Judges, with the sense of distribution of lots of land, such as Num 26:55. Gerhard von Rad, \textit{The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays} (trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken; London: SCM, 1984), 82.
the messianic age.\textsuperscript{124} This interpretation of the יַהֲנָּם underlies the messianic understanding of 4Q279. Line 4’s reference to “the sons of Aaron,” used as a referent to describe the identity of the priests, further hints at a form of Davidic messianism such as that observed in 4QFlor 4Q174. A dating in the second half of the first century B.C.E. seems reasonable when considering the possibility of a messianic resurgence in response to the reign of Herod.\textsuperscript{125} The early Herodian formal script found in the manuscript for 4Q279 itself dates to ca. 30-1 B.C.E., and lends confirmation to this theory.\textsuperscript{126}

As a final note regarding dating the text, the reference within 4Q279 Frag. 5, 4 to “the sons of Aaron” is absent from both CD XIV, 3-6 as well as 1QS II, 19-23, both being passages which also place priests in a hierarchical listing.\textsuperscript{127} This reference to “the sons of Aaron” could be intended to function in the same fashion as the addition of “the sons of Zadok” to the text of 1QS V, 9, a phrase which is noticeably absent from the parallels in 4QS\textsuperscript{b} and 4QS\textsuperscript{d}. In 1QS V, 9, “the sons of Zadok” is added to the text in order for the movement’s members to clarify their place, according to Sarianna Metso, as “the true keepers of the covenant.”\textsuperscript{128} If the very composition of 4Q279 borrowed from the phraseology of CD XIV, 3-6, and if “the sons of Aaron” is indeed a textual addition to that phraseology with a similar-minded intent as in 1QS V, 9, then 4Q279 appears to be a work based on and created after the compositions of CD XIV and 1QS II, lending further credibility to 4Q279’s dating in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{124}Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 222.\
\textsuperscript{125}See section 2.2.1 of the present chapter on the topic of relating a Davidic messianism to a textual dating during the time of Herod, and the similar connection with 4Q174.\
\textsuperscript{126}Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 218.\
\textsuperscript{127}The excerpt from 1QS II, 19-23 reads as follows: “The priests shall cross over 20 first into the order (קדש), according to their spirits, one after the other. Then the Levites shall cross over after them, 21 then all the people shall cross over thirdly into the order, one after the other, by thousands, hundreds, 22 fifties, and tens, so that every single Israelite may know his standing place in the Community (יחד) of God 23 for an eternal council.” The kaph from יַהֲנָם is actually in medial form.\
\textsuperscript{128}Metso, “Creating,” 289. See also n. 6 of the present chapter, for a description of the redactional history of “sons of Aaron” and “sons of Zadok.”
\end{flushright}
the later first century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{129}

With regard to provenance, 4Q279 shares a theme of Davidic messianism with the S tradition-related 4QFlor, and shares links with both D and S traditions with numerous other references to lots (גורל). On the other hand, 4Q279 has a closer affiliation to D than S in terms of the four-fold hierarchical listing which includes a gēr. The gēr is present twice in the listings of CD XIV 3-6, but is absent from 1QS II, 19-23. 4QFour Lots appears more closely aligned to the D tradition.

2.3.3 Texts Correlated with the Serek (S) Tradition

2.3.3.1 4Q169, 4QNahum Pesher Frags. 3-4, II, 7-10

7 (Nah 3:4) ‘Because of the multitude of the fornications of the well-favoured sex trade worker, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her fornications and families through her witchcrafts.’\textsuperscript{130}
8 [Its] interpretation [con]cerns those who lead Ephraim astray, who, by their false teaching and their lying tongue and lip of deceit, will lead many astray, 9 kings, princes, priests and people together with the gēr. Cities and families will perish through their counsel, n[ob]les and rul[ers] 10 will fall due to the cursing of their tongues.

Concerning the passage where the gēr has been employed within 4QpNah 4Q169, John Allegro’s suggested reading of גר נלוה is maintained.\textsuperscript{131} However, line 10 prefers עם (עם ועתי אפר) (akin

\textsuperscript{129}On the other hand, the phrase “the sons of Aaron” could be added secondarily within 4Q279, just as in 1QS V, 9. However, no multiple versions of 4Q279 exist, suggesting that “the sons of Aaron” as a phrase is written into the original composition of 4Q279, and as an addition to phraseology borrowed from the likes of CD XIV 3-6.

\textsuperscript{130}The present study has altered slightly the English vocabulary within Allegro’s DJD rendering of Nah 3:4. Cf. Allegro, Qu
cran Cave 4: 4, 38, 40.

\textsuperscript{131}An alternate reading, that of גנולה (גנולה גר נלוה) (“the gēr attached to them”), has been proposed by Strugnell and others. However, Shani Berrin considers the addition of the third person m. pl. possessive suffix, attached to a niphal participle, to be “awkward.” In Chapter 3 of the present study, the גנולה גר (a gēr who has attached himself) will be likened to other majority scriptural examples, such as Isa 14:1. This other example follows the format of
to Hos 7:16) over Allegro’s rendering of מִעם[מ]. The gēr reference occurs in the midst of a number of terms and characters who may represent various veiled historical references. The broader narrative scope of these characters in 4Q169 is considered to the extent that the findings assist with determining the provenance and dating of the text. In the case of this text, conclusions made concerning allusions to historical events create a fairly clear guideline as to the text’s terminus post quem (no sooner than 63 B.C.E.). For this reason, features such as paleography and orthographic similarities need not feature prominently in determining date and provenance where this text is concerned. In Allegro’s original work with fragments from 4Q169, the only observation he makes concerning the handwriting itself is that the “letters of the neat, characteristic book-hand of Qumran, are about 2 mm. square.”

Two historical leaders may first be identified. From Allegro’s first 1956 publication of part of 4Q169 and onward in scholarship, the theory has prevailed that the “Lion of Wrath,” mentioned in 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, I, 5, should be identified with the Sadducean-backed Alexander Jannaeus. Jannaeus ruled as high priest and king of Judea from 103 B.C.E. until his death in 76 B.C.E. Allegro writes: “We have in this pešer the first identifiable proper names to come out of Qumran literature, and a concrete historical situation from which it is not difficult to identify its chief character, the Lion of Wrath.”

The “historical situation” to which he alludes is the interpretation of Nahum 2:13 in Frags. 3-4, I, 7-8, with reference to the following:

the Lion of Wrath 7 [. . . ven]geance on the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things when he hangs men up alive 8 [. . . ] in Israel beforetime, for of the man hanged alive upon a tree it [re]ads: ‘Behold I am against [thee.]

simple niphal without the pronominal suffix (בָּלָה), making Allegro’s version the preferred reading. See Shani L. Berrin, The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169 (STDJ 53; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 62, and n. 93.

Berrin recommends this preferred restoration, pointing out that Allegro’s choice of מעם could not be translated as his suggested “because of what they say,” because a spatial nuance of “with” would be required. Berrin, The Pesher Nahum Scroll, 62, and n. 94.


The Pharisaic Jewish opponents of Jannaeus called on the help of the Greek Seleucid king Demetrius III to overthrow Jannaeus. Following this victory by Demetrius, many of the rebels changed their minds and returned their allegiance to Jannaeus. Subsequently, Jannaeus was able to defeat Demetrius. According to Josephus, Jannaeus then took revenge on eight hundred of these rebel Judeans with death by crucifixion. It appears that the account in 4Q169 corroborates this crucifixion narrative. Once it is agreed that the Lion of Wrath represents Alexander Jannaeus, the historical identity of other figures in the text may also fall into place. If the Lion of Wrath is Jannaeus, then “Demetrius, king of Greece,” named in Frags. 3-4, I, 2, must be Demetrius III Eucaerus, the Seleucid Greek ruler who reigned from 94-88 B.C.E. These two references begin to determine a time frame for the composition of 4Q169.

The identification of certain sectarian groups in relation to other historical allusions also assist in determining the dating of 4Q169. For example, the reference in Frags. 3-4, I, 2 to the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” (דורשי החלקות) is perceived as an allusion to the Pharisees: “Its interpretation [of Nah 2:12] concerns Demetrius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the counsel of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.” These Seekers are the Pharisaic Jews who entreated the help of Demetrius III in order to overthrow Jannaeus, a Hasmonean member backed by the Sadducees. It is also suggested that the Pharisee Seekers-after-Smooth-Things are equated with “the city of Ephraim,” according to Frags. 3-4, II, 2: “it is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things at the end of

---

135 See Josephus, Ant. 13.372-83. The matching of the 4Q169 narrative with the historical event between Demetrius III and Alexander Jannaeus is described succinctly by Allegro in his original publication on 4QpNah 4Q169, Allegro, “Further Light,” 92; also, Hanan Eshel devotes a chapter to describing the conflict and identifying the key figures of 4Q169, as well as some of the opposing views to this theory, see Ch. 6 “The Pharisees’ Conflict with Alexander Jannaeus and Demetrius’ Invasion of Judaea,” in Hanan Eshel, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State (SDSS; Grand Rapids, MI; Jerusalem, Israel: Eerdmans; Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008), 117–31; finally, John Collins also identifies Demetrius III and Alexander Jannaeus as the figures involved in this pesher, and describes the narrative’s purpose from the lens of sectarian “prophetic” prophecy fulfillment, see John J. Collins, “Prophecy and History in the Pesharim,” in Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 209–26.

136 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 213.
days, who in ‘lies’ and falsehood[s] conduct themselves.” Thus the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, and the Pharisees are all one and the same. In such a case, “Ephraim” does not represent “genealogical non-Judahites” and “the geographical area inhabited by them,” but rather denotes the Pharisees as a “particular group of opponents,” according to Shani Berrin. John Collins suggests that Frags. 3-4, IV, 5-6, in which the cup of “the wicked ones of Ephraim” comes after “Manasseh,” refers to “the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C.E.” In 63 B.C.E. Pompey entered Jerusalem after John Hyrcanus II opened the city gates. After three months of siege, Pompey then entered the Temple and the holy of holies. Hyrcanus was to govern Judea, under Roman control. Because Hyrcanus’ mother Salome Alexandra had befriended the Pharisees, the Pharisees come to be equated to Hyrcanus, who is affiliated with the Roman Pompey. In this fashion, the “Pharisees” as “wicked ones of Ephraim” capture Jerusalem, and the text could describe this historical event. Collins suggests that some of these “prophecies” are “ex eventu” and are already an event in the past. This information would answer the question regarding when the text was composed, and provide a date certainly sometime after Jannaeus’ rule of 103-76 B.C.E., and also likely after the siege of 63 B.C.E. A mid-first century B.C.E. dating for 4Q169 fits within the dating for the height of the Qumran movement.

With regard to the question of 4Q169’s provenance and any possible relationship with either the D or S traditions, an answer is fairly clear. Collins suggests that the pesharim, with their already partially fulfilled prophecies, are intended to “reassure the members of the

---

137 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 214.
138 Berrin, The Pesher Nahum Scroll, 27. A different theory exists, forwarded by Gregory Doudna, which is that “Ephraim” actually represents “Israel” and “the expected victim.” In such a case, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things would also have to be “Israel” and not the Pharisees who gave advice to Demetrius, according to the narrative of Frags. 3-4, I, 2-3. According to Doudna, “there is nothing in the language itself of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in 4QpNah or in any other Qumran text that calls for a Pharisee identification.” Gregory L. Doudna, 4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition (JSPSup 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 656, see also 29. Based on the narrative conclusion, the more specific identifier of “Pharisees” is preferred.
139 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 215. “Manasseh” has often been considered to represent “Sadducees,” who might represent the Jerusalem Temple in this case, even if it was technically under Hasmonean control. On “Manasseh” representing the Sadducees, see for example Eshel, Hasmonean State.
140 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 215.
that history was unfolding as had been foretold by the prophets, and that they would be vindicated in the not too distant future.”

Collins’ reference to the ייחד is suggestive that there is a relationship between the pesharim and the S movement. This suggestion relies on the fact that over fifty references to the noun “Community” (יחד) exist in 1QS, signifying a special connection between that word and the movement behind the S text tradition. And, while the term ייחד does not appear in 4QpNah 4Q169 specifically, it does appear in four other pesharim, namely the following: 1QPesher to Micah 1Q14 Frags. 8-10, 8 (“in the Council of the Community,” ייחד בעצת; 4QIsaiah Pesherד 4Q164 Frag. 1, I, 2 (“the Council of the Community,” ייחד בעצת; 4QPsalms Pesherא 4Q171, II, 15 (“in the Council of the Community,” ייחד בעצת; and IV, 19 (“the Congregation of the Community,” ייחד עדה; 4Q169 most likely connects to the ייחד and S tradition by means of the indirect connection in genre to these other pesharim which do contain the term, extant within the manuscript remains.

One question does remain, which is to consider why members of the Qumran movement, who did not care for the Pharisees, would write such a narrative. On the other hand, no sympathetic view is offered toward the Pharisee “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.” Allegro observes: “It is interesting to note that this pešer betrays no sympathy with the rebellious Pharisees who called in the foreigner, any more than with the Lion of Wrath himself.”

It is possible that members of the S tradition composed this text partially as proof of their superiority over the Pharisees and to explain the sinful behaviours that will surely bring about continued future calamities.

------------------------------------

141 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 211.
142 Allegro, “Further Light,” 92.
1. . .] enemy [. . . ‘And] the son of wickedness [shall no more afflict] him as at first, and as from the day that
2 [I commanded judges] (to be) over my people Israel’—that is the house which [. . . in] the end of days, as it is written in the book of
3 [. . . ‘The sanctuary, O Lord, which] thy hands have [es]tablishe d. YHWH will rule for ever and ever.’ That is the house ‘where there shall never more enter
4 [. . .] and the ‘Ammonite and the Moabite’ and ‘illegitimate child’ and ‘foreigner’ and gēr ‘for ever’, for my holy ones are there.

How does the gēr fit into 4QFlor 4Q174, a text described by Allegro as an eschatological work that performs midrash on several scriptural passages? George Brooke suggests that 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-4 refers to an eschatological sanctuary to which there is limited access. 4QFlor Frag. 1, I, 6 refers to a מקדש אדם (“a sanctuary of men”), which Brooke and others understand to be not an actual Temple building, but rather a “construction” of a group of people, an actual “sanctuary of men.” The sanctuary, could, however, also represent an

143 Some discrepancy exists concerning line 4’s final phrase, which Allegro transcribes and reads as קדושי שם ("my holy ones are there"). The passage has also been transcribed and read as קדוש שם ("his holy ones are there"), for example according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar. In this case, a reading of a vav is suggested instead of the yod, implying a third person m. s. suffix instead of first person, effectively making YHWH a third person referent instead of a first person speaker. Finally, a transcription of שם has been suggested by Katell Berthelot, but with a reading of “saints of the name.” In this case, the yod signifies a tsere-yod m. pl. construct ending, and one would point שם ("name") instead of שם ("there"). Berthelot looks to ג'נש שם as an indicator, as found in 1QSa II, 2, 8 and 11, as well as in 1QM II, 6. Regardless of how one chooses to transcribe and translate the passage however, it remains clear that the listed figures are excluded because they are not holy, while whomever resides in the “house” is holy. Allegro, Qumran Cave 4: I, 53–4; Martínez and Tigchelaar, 2 vols., 352–3; Berthelot, “La Notion de gēr,” 204–5.

144 The present study has chosen two alternative terms in the translation: first, the term “illegitimate child” is used to describe the ממזר; and second, a “foreigner” is used to describe the נכר, instead of Allegro’s translation “alien,” which could be confused with the actual נכר.


147 Joseph M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 82; Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, 136, 187. Brooke concludes that “the threefold description of the sanctuary describes its exclusive
actual eschatological Temple. Either way, Frag. 1, I, 4 identifies those who should never be permitted to enter the sanctuary (described in line 3 as详, “the house”): מוכמום ומואב, “and the ‘Ammonite and the Moabite’ and ‘illegitimate child’ and ‘foreigner’ and gēr ‘for ever’, for my holy ones are there.” Among those excluded persons is the gēr.

To understand the eschatological nature of the document may help in determining the original date of composition of 4Q174. 4Q174’s end-time has a specific messianic expectation of the Davidic line restored, due to the citation from 2 Sam 7:10-14, in which YHWH prophesies through Nathan that David’s royal throne shall be established forever. The repeated use of the term “last days” (אחרי הימים, appearing in Frag. 1, I, lines 2, 12, 15, and 19, furthermore enhances the work’s concern with “the re-establishment of the House of David in the last days.”

Davidic messianism could be dated to either a later second or general first century B.C.E. dissatisfaction with the Hasmonaeans (per Collins), or more specifically to a later date within the same century (post 37 B.C.E., per Brooke). The text itself is written in a Herodian script and can be dated to the end of the 1st century B.C.E. or as late as the mid-first century C.E. The previously observed similarity between the nature, the fact that it will not be desolated and that, proleptically, God constitutes it of men whose works of thanksgiving are the smoke-sacrifices of the sanctuary,” 187.

Joseph Baumgarten subsequently changes his mind (see previous note). Instead of the sanctuary in 4Q174 representing “the purified community of the latter days, rather than the Temple,” Baumgarten later suggests that “we must allow for the co-ordination of Qumran communal ideology with actual Temple regulations.” Baumgarten suggests that the Qumran movement is adding “impediments on the entrance of gērîm into the Temple precincts,” to stand in opposition to contemporary Temple practices which did not. Baumgarten considers gērîm to be proselytes (converts). Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I,” JJS 33, no. 1–2 (1982): 216–17.

John M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” JBL 75, no. 3 (September 1956): 176. Specifically, the theme concerning the end-time rise of the Davidic Kingdom may be observed in 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, lines 10-13.

See section 2.2.1 of the present chapter for an outline of Brooke’s theory regarding a Davidic messianism relating to a time within Herod’s reign.

Brooke provides an overview concerning the history of scholarship on the dating of the text based primarily on paleographical grounds, Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, 83–84.
handwriting of 4Q174 and that of 4QOrd and 4Q159, which was found to date in the second half of the first century B.C.E., suggests a time period within the later first century B.C.E.

Finally, what can be said regarding provenance and any possible relationship between 4Q174 and either of the two primary rule traditions of D and S? Allegro has observed links to both. For example, the phrase in 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 14 regarding “those who turn aside from the way” (סרי מדרך) can be found in various related, although never identical, forms in CD I, 13; II, 6; VIII, 4, 16; XIX 17, 29; 1QS IX, 20; and X, 21. It is likely that 4Q174 borrowed the wording from either the D or S rule documents. However, the fact that 4Q174 also contains a reference “( לעצת היחד to the Council of the Community”) in Frag. 1, I, 17, suggests a closer relationship to the S tradition of the Qumran movement, rather than the group behind the D manuscripts.

---

152 See the section on 4Q159 in the present chapter, section 2.3.2.4. A similarity in handwriting between 4Q159 and 4Q174 need not upset the present conclusion that 4Q159 correlates with the tradition of D and 4Q174 with that of S (see below). The present chapter has already observed that the traditions of D and S progressed simultaneously and likely borrowed one from the other.

153 Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 55; see also Allegro, “Fragments,” 353.

154 Allegro translates this phrase in the following fashion: “to the counsel of the community.” He is using the term in an non proper-noun sense.
2.3.4 Texts Correlated with the Qumran Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serek (S) Tradition Indeterminate

2.3.4.1 4Q307, *4QText Mentioning Temple*, Frag. 1

4QText Mentioning Temple 4Q307 Frag. 1, 6, contains the phrase יִהְיֶה כוֹל הָגָר הַנֶּשׁ for which Timothy Lim suggests the following translation: "‘yhyh any hğēr who remai[n]s (?)'."\(^{155}\) If the first word may be regarded as complete, then it could be read as the 3ms imperfect of the verb יִהְיֶה, “to be.” In that case, the phrase would translate as “and it shall be that any gēr who remains.”

Regarding establishing a date of composition for 4Q307, all that can be said is that the scribe wrote using a Hasmonean or early Herodian hand, suggesting a manuscript date sometime from within the later second century and throughout the first century B.C.E.\(^{156}\)


\(^{156}\)Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” 255.
Concerning provenance, the word “all” (מה) exhibits the *plene* spelling identified by Tov as one of the markers of the special Qumran writing system, suggesting a connection between 4Q307 and the Qumran movement.\(^{157}\) The fragmentary nature of the text makes any definitive correlation of 4Q307 with D or S traditions more difficult, however. For example, 4Q307 Frag. 2, 2 contains a fragmentary reference to מַכֵּדֶשׁ ("in the Temple"); the term is common within D (e.g. CD IV, 1, 18; V, 6; VI, 16; XII, 1-2), but not S. On the other hand, the term is not absent from the S tradition overall. 4Q*Flor* 4Q174 refers to בְּמֵיהֶלֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל ("the sanctuary of I[rael]") in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 6.\(^{158}\) And, as has been observed, 4Q*Flor* has a definite connection to the S tradition. Therefore 4Q307 has a connection to the Qumran movement overall, but a definite alignment between 4Q307 and the tradition of either D or S cannot be determined.

---

\(^{157}\) In Tov’s table listing particular vocabulary words using Qumran spelling, מַכֵּדֶשׁ is the first column identified. Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 50.

\(^{158}\) Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 53–54.
2.3.4.2 4Q498 *Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments*, Frag. 7

1 1) h to the gēr [ 
2 ]v. [

Other fragments of interest are as follows:

Other fragments of interest are as follows:

Frag. 2
[ןב] [ 1
[ותיהל] [ 2
[ז] [ 3
[ר] [ 4
[ש] [ 5

Frag. 3, Col. II Frag. 3, Col. I
[כ] [ 1
[כ] [ 2
[א] [ 3

Frag. 3, Col. II Frag. 3, Col. I
[כ] [ 1
[כ] [ 2
[א] [ 3

Frag. 4
[ז] [ 1
[ז] [ 2

Frag. 6
[ב] [ 1
[ב] [ 2

Frag. 8
[ב] [ 1
lower margin?

Frag. 15
[א] [ 1

Among the total fragments of the document named by Maurice Baillet as *Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments* (*Hym/Sap*) 4Q498,159 Fragment 7 refers to a לגיר, concerning which

Baillet considers both the *yod* and the *resh* to be uncertain. He does not explain his rationale for defining these letters as such. All *vavs* and *yods* within the various fragments of 4Q498 are identical in appearance, which likely explains Baillet’s hesitancy to firmly suggest one or the other, even though the letter itself is clear. Looking at the *resh*, the fragment ends very abruptly at the edge of the letter, leaving its left-hand edge not fully in view, leading one to agree with Baillet that the letter is not entirely certain. The *lamed* and *gimel* are quite clear, however. The last letter of a word preceding the proposed לָלִינוּ, marked as an uncertain *he* by Baillet, is difficult to distinguish between either a *he* or a *khet*, but is clearly one of the two. Nevertheless, based on the relative clarity of the plate itself, and also the subsequent relationship to be discussed in Chapter 3 that links the לָלִינוּ of Frag. 7 to the לָלִינוּ of Deut 26:12, it is safe to proceed with Baillet’s text reconstruction.

What can be said concerning the dating and provenance of this fragment and work behind it? The fragments use a Herodian style, suggesting a turn-of-the-first-century C.E. dating. Baillet suggests לָלִינוּ as a *plene* spelling for לָלִינוּ, citing as predecessors the *plene* spelling of לָלִינוּ from Deut 5:14 in 8Q3, along with לָלִינוּ from a Samaritan manuscript of Deut 10:19. The feature of *plene* spelling is once more reminiscent of Tov’s Qumran scribal practice. Related to the question of provenance, Frag. 2, 2, מַרְיַם מְנַחֲלֵי (“and streams of wa[ters]”), which will be compared to Deut 8:7 in Chapter 3, is also used with a slight grammatical variant (kaph, “like” instead of vav, “and”), in *IQHodayot* 1QHa XVII, 5: “וַדְמַעְתִי כְּנַחֲלֵי מַיָּהוֹס“ and my tears are like streams of water[s].” Admittedly, the phrase is used as a simile in this *Hodayot* lament, which is different than its literal usage in Deut 8:7 and

160 Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q498 at the Scrollery in person in August 2012.

161 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 74. 8Q3 is a phylactery containing portions of Exodus 12, 13, and 20; and Deuteronomy 5, 6, 10, and 11. According to M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, the scribal handwriting appears to date from the first century C. E. See Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’*, 149–57, esp. 154–55.

presumed usage in 4Q498 to describe the promise of "a land of streams of waters." Nevertheless, the phrase "(יָמִים נְחָלי מים) streams of waters") is fairly unique, occurring in 4Q498 and 1QHa within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, and occurring in majority scripture only in Deut 8:7; 10:7; and Jer 31:9. A connection may exist between the phrase and the tradition that favours it. The Hodayot, in its various manuscripts, makes multiple references to the תְּנֵא, suggesting an affiliation with the Qumran movement’s S tradition. 4Q498, by way of its connection to 1QHa XVII, 5 via a shared use of the phrase “streams of waters,” in addition to its use of plene spelling, may be correlated with the Qumran movement, and the S tradition in particular. The connection to the movement as a whole seems likely; the connection to the S tradition is possible albeit tenuous.

2.3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back, Frag. 45

1 )רֵי [ ]
2 )נ ‘וּד [ ]
3 ) the גֶּרֶים ‘זַו [ ]
4 ) their . . . [ ]

4QNonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back (papUnclassified frags. verso)

4Q520 consist of forty-five fragments which, while all originally contained writing on both sides, now conserve only the text on one side (the verso). Fragment 45 is the text of interest, in which the third line contains the key word גֶּרֶים, followed by the partially cut-off word . . .

163 See pp. 91-92 of the present chapter concerning the term תְּנֵא, its connections to the S tradition, and its close connection to the pesharim by means of this shared terminology. In addition, Schuller and Newsom also correlate the Hodayot psalms with the S tradition: “They reflect the distinctive vocabulary and religious ideas that marked the type of Judaism found in other core works such as the Rule of the Community and the War Scroll, and at least some poems may have been composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of this sect.” Schuller and Newsom, The Hodayot, 1.
Having had opportunity to study the plate, the firm reading of גרים can be confirmed.\textsuperscript{164} With regard to the definite article that Baillet suggests at the beginning of the word, only the left horizontal stroke of the letter he is available to the naked eye. The present study concludes that גרים represents גרים (the gērîm), as in 1 Ch 22:2, or even גרים (“the ones who are sojourning,” also sometimes understood as “the resident aliens”), as in Lev 25:6; Lev 25:45; and Ezek 47:22, but not גרים (“the Hagrites”), of Psalm 83:7.\textsuperscript{165} The proper noun “Hagrites” occurs three times with an aleph (הָגִּרְתֵּים) as found in 1 Chr 5:10; 5:19; and 5:20, and only occurs once without the aleph, in the Psalm 83:7 passage listed above. An absence of aleph in גרים of line 3 makes this option of the proper name unlikely. With regard to Baillet’s proposed letters ayin, zayin, and vav for the partial word following גרים, the letter designated as vav could instead be a final nun.\textsuperscript{166} The ayin and zayin are clear, however. Remaining unaware of any word גֶּרֶשׁ, the third letter more likely represents a vav, as proposed.

Concerning the provenance and dating of 4Q520, one observes plene spelling in הבֹּברִים, located in Frag. 1, 2, suggesting an overall relationship between 4Q520 and the Qumran movement. Beyond that, charting specific ties to the traditions of D or S is made difficult by the fragmentary nature of the text. Baillet suggests that certain fragments from within those designated as 4Q520 might belong to other of the published fragments of DJD III.\textsuperscript{167} This information could instruct regarding the dating and provenance of 4Q520, since Baillet offers no individual assessment of 4Q520 itself on those matters. Qumran fragmentary manuscripts 4Q496; 4Q497; 4Q506; and 4Q512 are all listed as possible manuscripts to which certain of the 4Q520 fragments might belong.\textsuperscript{168} Baillet does not give a rationale for these possible

\textsuperscript{164}Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q520 at the Scrollery in person in August 2012.

\textsuperscript{165}Each of these options has been proposed by Baillet. Baillet, \textit{Qumran Grotte 4: III}, 312.

\textsuperscript{166}Thank-you to Chad Stauber for making this observation while studying the plate.

\textsuperscript{167}Baillet, \textit{Qumran Grotte 4: III}, 309.

\textsuperscript{168}Baillet, \textit{Qumran Grotte 4: III}, 309–11.
redesignations. However, if Baillet suggests that certain fragments from among 4Q520 and these other manuscript fragments could belong together, then whatever physical observations Baillet makes regarding those other manuscript fragments should also apply to 4Q520. Therefore, a brief consideration of these four other manuscripts may provide results concerning the provenance and dating of 4Q520. The consideration of these other manuscripts will not confirm that any 4Q520 fragments actually belong elsewhere; rather, the comparison is solely for the purpose of discerning the dating and provenance of 4Q520.

Baillet has made observations concerning the dating or provenance for each of the manuscripts 4Q496; 4Q497; 4Q506; and 4Q512. The first in the list, 4Q496 War Scroll papM, like 4Q520, is written on the verso of a papyrus. The recto originally contained liturgical prayers; subsequently, the scroll was then reused by two other scribes who wrote on the verso, first a part of the War Scroll and then the Words of the Luminaries 4Q506. The War Scroll component is written in a pre-Herodian hand, likely prior to 50 B.C.E. The scribal hand that wrote the second fragmentary work under consideration, 4Q506 Words of the Luminaries papDibHam, Baillet considers “quite evolved” and may date to the middle of the first century C.E. The third fragmentary work, 4Q497 papWar Scroll-like Text A, is published on the verso of the hymn or prayer fragments of 4Q499. Baillet dates the handwriting on the verso of this papyrus to approximately 50 B.C.E. The fourth and final work to mention is 4Q512 Purification Ritual. It is the verso of the papyrus upon whose recto, written by a different hand, is 4Q503 Daily Prayers. Baillet considers the handwriting of 4Q512 to consist of a Hasmonean calligraphy that dates to the beginning of the first century B.C.E.

---

169 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 56–7. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
170 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 57.
171 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 170.
172 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 69.
173 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 262.
174 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 262.
Comparing 4Q520 to the findings from these other four texts offers clues concerning the manuscript’s provenance and dating. One can assume that in suggesting a connection between 4Q520 and these other four manuscripts, Baillet also would date 4Q520, at least in terms of the manuscript date if not the actual original composition of the work, somewhere between roughly the mid-first century B.C.E. to the mid-first century C.E. Furthermore, because Baillet has tentatively related the scribal hand of 4Q520 with another text correlated to the S tradition, namely the War Scroll and the numerous \( \text{יחד} \) references contained in that text, barring any evidence to suggest otherwise, 4Q520 might correlate with the S tradition of the Qumran movement, as well.\(^{175}\) As with 4Q498, a connection to the Qumran movement seems evident, but the specific connection between 4Q520 and the tradition of S is tenuous.

### 2.4 Chapter Conclusions

The present study confirms the notion that there is a sectarian movement associated with the DSS located at Qumran, and that two primary traditions, correlated with the two primary rules of D and S, exist within this movement. The study determined not to associate this movement with the “Essenes” or other established sectarian groups, but instead to study the scrolls that employ the \( \text{גֶּר} \) using scriptural rewriting to see whether they would fit within the parameters of the Qumran movement overall, since not every manuscript is guaranteed to associate directly with this sectarian “Teacher’s movement.” Furthermore, the study determined to examine the scrolls that employ the \( \text{גֶּר} \) to see whether they would fit within the parameters of either the D or S traditions specifically. This chapter has performed that task.

The term \( \text{גֶּר} \), while often partly corrupted, was confirmed in each case as the noun in question, located in either singular or plural forms, and sometimes with a definite article or other preposition or article attached. Furthermore, each text was confirmed to correlate with

\(^{175}\)See the discussion on pp. 91-92 of the present chapter whereby frequent usage of the term \( \text{יחד} \) is correlated with the S tradition, specifically.
the Qumran movement, apart from one case (4Q423) whereby the text seems to precede the formative period of the movement. Concerning the remaining texts, correlations for the most part were established with either the D (Damascus) or S (Serek) traditions, although in three cases a clear choice in correlation with either the D or S traditions remains indeterminate. A summary of the provenance and dating of the texts is as follows:

2.4.1 A Text That Precedes D and S Traditions

4QInstruction appears to precede D and S, and dates to second century B.C.E. within a Hasmonean era time frame.

2.4.2 Texts Correlated with the D Tradition

The Damascus Document belongs to the Qumran movement, whose formation was in the late second century B.C.E. and whose “high tide” rests in the first century B.C.E. Fragments 4Q266-4Q269, which contain overlaps to the passages of interest CD VI, 14-VII, 1 and XIV, 3-6, date in the first half to the mid-first century B.C.E., early Herodian, early first century C.E., and late first century B.C.E., respectively. The textual overlaps are very close and assure the present study that the 4QD fragments of interest match the readings of CD which include the term gēr.

Temple Scroll dates between 119-104 B.C.E. and correlates with the “formative D” tradition.

4QApocryphal Pentateuch B 4Q377 dates between 100-150 B.C.E. and correlates with the D tradition.

4QOrdinances 4Q159 dates between 63 B.C.E. and 37 B.C.E. (i.e. mid-first century B.C.E.) and correlates with the D tradition.

4QFour Lots 4Q279 dates to the later first century B.C.E., (i.e. post 30 B.C.E.), and correlates with the D tradition.
2.4.3 Texts Correlated with the S Tradition

*4QNahum Pesher* 4Q169 dates post 63 B.C.E. (i.e. mid-first century B.C.E.) and correlates with the S tradition.

*4QFlorilegium* 4Q174 dates to the later first century B.C.E. (post 37 B.C.E.) and correlates with the S tradition.

2.4.4 Texts Correlated with the Qumran Movement: Alignment with D or S Tradition Indeterminate

*4QText Mentioning Temple* 4Q307 dates to the later second or first century B.C.E. and correlates with either the D or S tradition.

*4QHymnic or Sapiential Fragments* 4Q498 is Herodian, dating between the mid-first century B.C.E. to the mid-first century C.E., and correlates with the Qumran movement and tenuously the S tradition.

*4QNonclassified Fragments* 4Q520 dates between the mid-first century B.C.E. to the mid-first century C.E. and correlates with the Qumran movement, and tenuously the S tradition.

In this quest to determine the meaning of the *gēr* within the DSS, the next chapter studies the manner in which the *gēr* employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS changes between these occasions of scriptural rewriting and majority scripture.
Chapter 3  
A Textual Study of the Occasions Where the Term Gēr Has Been Employed within Scriptural Rewriting in the DSS

This thesis has undertaken an examination of the gēr within the DSS with the aim of discovering whether the term within the Qumran movement represents a meaning of a “resident alien,” a “Gentile convert to Judaism,” or even something else. Discovering a meaning for the term within the context of the DSS will reveal the extent of Hellenistic influence and ethnic mutability on the Qumran movement as a group integral to understanding late Second Temple Judaism. The term gēr has been chosen for this study precisely because it has served as a proven indicator in the past within scriptural tradition to denote this shift in meaning from resident alien to convert.

The study began in Chapter 2 with the preliminary task of studying each occasion where the gēr is employed within scriptural rewriting the DSS. The texts in which the term was found were assessed to see whether they fit within the time frame of the Qumran movement overall, and to see whether they correlated with either of the two primary Damascus (D) or Serek (S) traditions of the movement. The chapter also verified the reading of the term gēr itself within what are often fragmentary textual remains.

Chapter 3 now analyzes the occasions where the term gēr has been employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS to compare the rewritten texts against identifiable majority scriptural predecessors. Occasionally, comparisons are also made where appropriate between the DSS that employ the term gēr and other scrolls. On this textual and literary level, the purpose of the chapter is to discern how the term gēr may change between textual interpretations. The chapter’s working method is to look for scriptural rewriting, that is, the recognizable reuse of scripture, that will highlight changes made to a text or idea over time.
These changes may reflect sociohistorical perspectives at the time of the text’s rewriting, just as the changes previously noted surrounding the term gēr within scriptural tradition highlighted a change in meaning from “resident alien” to “convert.” Based on these literary findings, preliminary observations are made concerning the meaning of the gēr in each text. The chapter will discover that whether or not the gēr is included in the community behind the text, the manner in which the gēr changes between scriptural rewriting and textual predecessor always indicates that this figure is a Judean convert. Shared kinship is the strongest feature prevalent; the feature of connection to land is also prevalent and often signals the shared kinship. Certain differences in attitude toward the gēr will be noted between the texts that correlate with the D and S traditions.

As a manner of proceeding, the chapter analyzes the text in the immediate proximity to the references to the gēr, whether that includes a few lines, or the fragment or column. In a few cases, the manuscript is very fragmentary and prior research concerning majority scriptural predecessors is slim. In these cases, the fragments, or selected fragments, are analyzed more expansively to discover any overarching themes that may uncover the character of the gēr used in the text. Sometimes a scriptural predecessor will be observed by drawing upon short phrases or even one unique verbal form. Often various phrases or allusions from majority scripture seem to be collated together. To demonstrate definitively whether a scribe purposefully collated various texts or not would be a challenge, but readers who are left with a number of fragments to consider can only work with the left over “remains of events” and see what new collage is created. In so doing, the present work borrows from the anthropological theory of bricolage, developed by Claude Lévi-Stauss.\(^1\) The “bricoleur,” according to Lévi-Stauss, works with “whatever is at hand” within a closed universe of instruments\(^2\). Items, or “events,” are saved which “may come in handy,” but each

---

saved event does not have only one definite and determinate use. Thus the risk exists that using this process of looking to both the literal and figurative “remains” of texts (and in so doing relating them to majority scripture) may not always prove that a scribe had these same passages in mind as a predecessor. However, it has been demonstrated elsewhere in DSS research that scribes do seem to collate prior texts, even likely from memory. Thus the method of bricolage will be used where required, in the hope of identifying changes to texts indicated by the methods of scribal manipulation, such as additions, conflations, omissions, or substitutions.

Finally, texts are organized in the same order as in Chapter 2, according to the established (or indeterminate) correlations with either the D or S traditions, in addition to their chronological date of composition within those categories.

3.1 A Text That Precedes Damascus (D) and Serek (S) Traditions: 4Q423, 4QInstruction9 Frag. 5, 1-4

1 [ ] the judgement of Korah. And as he opened your ear
2 [ to the mystery that is to come ] your . . . [ every he]ad of [your] fathers [ ] and leader of your people
3 [ he] divided the [p]ortion of all rulers and fashioned every [dee]d by his hand, and the wages of
4 [their deeds he knew. He will judg]e all of them in truth and visit upon fathers and sons,[ upon gērî]m together with every native born.

Lévi-Strauss, Savage Mind, 18.
Aharon Shemesh looks to the Penal Code example of 1QS VII, 12-16 where he determines that seemingly unrelated regulations (walking naked, spitting, showing oneself, guffawing) are actually based on an interpretation of Deut 23:11-15, namely that nothing unseemly should be seen. Shemesh concludes that various majority scripture verses will generate units of law within texts of the Qumran movement. Shemesh argues that “the authors of the scrolls memorized the biblical text and could recall it at will,” and that majority scripture served as a “natural framework” upon which to arrange material of the Qumran movement. While Shemesh is referring to legal material specifically, this same idea could be applied to other texts of the Qumran movement. Aharon Shemesh, “Biblical Exegesis and Interpretations from Qumran to the Rabbis,” in A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 484–6 (citation from 486).
4QInst 4Q423 Fragment 5, in which the term gēr has been employed, describes in line 3 that “he divided the portion of all rulers.” Gerhard von Rad, who conducted a study of the word “portion (lit. inheritance, נחלָה)” within Hexateuchal sources, concluded that “the term נחלָה applied originally to the hereditary lands of both families and tribes.”

He observed that “נחלה of Israel as a whole . . . [was] a peculiarity of Deuteronomy.” Von Rad identifies numerous passages that highlight a land being sworn to the Israelites, described sometimes as land sworn “to your ancestors” (lit. “your fathers,” e.g. Deut 6:18, or variably in the plural נחלָהים, e.g. Deut 8:1). 4Q423 appears to contain a Deuteronomic sentiment of an inheritance of land being divided among rulers of the land as a whole, and not individual tribes or families. The preceding chapter outlined Torleif Elgvin’s theory that the “head of your fathers” and “leader of your people”—who are both presumably included in the subsequent reference to “all rulers”—are to be viewed as those contemporary leaders of Israel, who are not recipients of the mystery of existence. It appears that the entities of line 4, namely the fathers, sons, native born, and gērîm, are also included under this group of rulers. Even if not “rulers” themselves, these entities are certainly grouped among the rulers as blind followers of the Hasmoneans. These entities would thus also be among those who have received a נחלָה. These recipients of a land-based inheritance would nevertheless not be privy to the mystery that is to come for movement members, if Elgvin’s interpretation is accurate.

In addition to these Deuteronomic references to inheritance for a nation, allusions to HL also appear within 4Q423. The pairing of the gēr with the native born (โบราณ) is a common feature throughout HL, such as Lev 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 24:16; and 24:22. In a
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8 Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction,” 519.
similar vein, Jan Joosten observes within HL pairings of the term *gēr* with other terms he deems to be synonymous to the ḥārāmites native born, namely “Israelites” (lit. “the children of Israel”) ֶלֶסֶנֶשׂ יֶרֶשֶׂ, e.g. Lev 17:12 and 20:2), as well as someone from the “house of Israel,” ֶלֶסֶנֶשׂ יֶשֶׂ, (e.g. Lev 17:8 and 17:10). Joosten suggests that the purpose of juxtaposing the *gēr* alongside any of these terms is to portray him as a foreigner resident alien as opposed to an ḥārāmites native born Israelite or Judean. Feasibly 4Q423 could intend these HL-themed juxtapositions for this purpose of specifically defining the *gēr* as a resident alien.

By contrast, Katell Berthelot points out that the pairing in 4Q423 can also suggest, as she argues it does in HL, that the *gēr* and the native born are both equal before the Torah, and that the *gēr* is a part of Israel in some way. This perspective of equality before the law is apparent in these same HL passages that pair the *gēr* with any of the synonymous entities of native born, Israelite, or member from the house of Israel. Disobeying the law may lead to any of these entities of native born, Israelite, member from the house of Israel, or *gēr*, to be just as equally “cut” (כרת) from the congregation or from YHWH’s people, as in Exod 12:19; Lev 17:10; and Num 15:30. The resulting implication is that in some way the *gēr* and the native born are both of this same congregation and YHWH’s people. HL’s juxtaposition of the *gēr* with the native born seems much better intended to represent legal (cultic) equality between the native born and *gēr*, than Joosten’s theory regarding a purpose of highlighting difference. This concept of equality between the *gēr* and native born of HL does not imply that the *gēr* of the postexilic HL has somehow become a Judean. Rather, the HL argues that the land must remain holy, therefore all inhabitants of the land whether Judean or resident alien must follow holiness laws in order to remain in the land, as is stipulated in Lev 18:24-30. Such an understanding behind the underlying text of HL lends a more open stance of

---

10Berthelot, “La Notion de ḥēr,” 179.
equality toward the gēr in its reuse within 4Q423, in a manner that could now represent something even more than mere equality before the law.

In sum, within 4Q423 Frag. 5, 1-4 is a Deuteronomic notion of land inheritance. Allusions to HL, such as those found in Exod 12:19; Lev 17:10 and Num 15:30, also emerge with 4Q423’s juxtaposition of the gēr with the ezrah, both of whom shall be equally visited upon. The combined notions of Deuteronomic inheritance which is only for “hereditary” Israelites but in 4Q423 seems also shared with the gērîm, along with the HL juxtaposition of equality between the gēr and the ezrah, create a new outcome for the gēr.11 This gēr appears to be included (beyond merely a non-Israelite who must follow cultic regulations) as one who dwells in the land. Instead, it seems more likely that this gēr represents a Gentile convert to Judaism, being judged equally as an Israelite, even if these Israelites are not among those receiving the mystery.

As a text that precedes the D and S traditions, this manuscript of 4Q423 provides an early example whereby a gēr has demonstrated conversion, in this case by the fact that he can receive an “inheritance,” suggesting a change in kinship and mutable ethnicity. The example of 4Q423 lends credibility to a conversion status for subsequent use of the term gēr in scriptural rewriting correlated with the Qumran movement. Because 4Q423 was found to be a predecessor of the Qumran movement which falls within the time frame of the “Teacher’s movement,” correlated with the rule traditions of D and S, this example will not be drawn into the collated textual assessment of Chapter 4. However, this example of a gēr employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS serves as a clear indicator of the gēr’s nature in the examples to come: the gēr is a Judean convert (whether accepted by the Qumran movement or not).

11Ezekiel 47:22-23 provides the unusual occasion whereby an inheritance of land will also be granted to gērîm, who are also to be treated “like” the ezrah (ןגא). However, Ezekiel 47 follows the model of land distribution to the individual tribes of Israel (Ezek 47:13, 21), and not to a nation as a whole, as in the largely Deuteronomic model mirrored in 4Q423, leaving the passage as an unlikely majority scriptural predecessor.
3.2. Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition

3.2.1 CD VI, 14-VII, 1

This passage of CD VI, 14-VII, 1 draws on scriptural language, evident in the references to widows (אָלְפָּנִית), orphans (יָדוֹת), the poor (עֹצֶם), the needy (אָבָרִים), and of course the gēr.

While scriptural predecessors have been suggested to include Lev 19:10; 23:22; Deut 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:14; and 17-21, one must ask whether the influence appears more strongly oriented in its nature to Deuteronomy or to HL. Combined references to widows and orphans are rooted in Deuteronomy, as they do not exist together in Leviticus or other HL material.

One might thus consider Deuteronomy to be the motivating text. However, CD VI, 20-VII, 1 reads “to love each man his brother (אחיהו) 21 as himself, to support the poor, destitute, and to seek each man the peace VII, 1 of his brother.”

12Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 205. Donaldson identifies all listed examples apart from Deut 24:14.
gē'r, vacat and to seek each man the peace of VII, 1 his brother (אחים).” Norbert Lohfink observes that it is only in HL, and not Deuteronomy, where one finds the poor and the gē'r side by side.\(^{13}\) In the HL material, Lev 19:10 and 23:22 both describe leaving gleanings behind for the poor and for the gē'r. Granted, Deut 24:14 seems to provide an exception, where one finds that both a brother (i.e., an Israelite) and a gē'r (a resident alien) can fall within the economic category of poor and needy temporary labourers.\(^{14}\) In addition, Ezek 22:29 contains references to the poor, needy, and gē'r existing in close proximity.\(^{15}\) The stronger parallels for this passage are nevertheless those that draw from HL.

The HL passage most likely rewritten in this CD excerpt is Leviticus Chapter 19. CD VI, 20-21’s stipulation “to love each man his brother 21 as himself” (לאהוב איש את אחיהו几名) is reminiscent of Lev 19:34’s stipulation that “the gē'r, the one sojourning with you, you shall love him like yourself” (לך הגר והגר תְּךֹּמֹמֹוָךְ). If the text conjures the images of poor, needy, orphan, widow, and gē'r, the reader could easily envision that the gē'r of Lev 19:34 has been substituted for the brother of CD VI, 20-21. The memory of the gē'r of Lev 19:34 conflates with the brother of CD VI, 20-21.

An additional HL passage is likely rewritten in CD VI, 20-VII,1. The regulation in that passage is also reminiscent of Lev 19:18: “you shall love your neighbour/friend like yourself” (לאהוב איש את רעהו). Katell Berthelot makes an argument that both brother (אח) and friend or neighbour (רעים) represent the Israelite brother within CD.\(^{16}\) Berthelot bases this argument on a parallel made between the reference in CD VIII, 6 concerning those who will receive God’s rage for “hating his neighbour [or friend]” (ושנוא איש את רעהו), and the command in Lev 19:17 that “You shall not hate your brother in your heart” (חיך את שנוא).
in which “brother” and “friend” appear interchangeable. The proposed outcome that the *gēr* and the brother have merged together as one within CD VI-VII need not change, even if, in the mind of a reader of CD, the “brother” that he should love like himself calls to mind Lev 19:18’s reference to “love your friend/neighbour as yourself” instead of Lev 19:34’s command to “love the *gēr* as yourself.” It is possible the shift to “brother” in CD VI, 20 from either “friend” or “*gēr*” is intended to demonstrate that the categories described in CD VI, 21 of poor, needy, and *gēr* are still “brothers.” Berthelot points out that the figures of poor, needy and *gēr* could still represent “brothers” as they are “situated between the command to love his brother like himself and that of seeking the peace of his brother.”

Thus both Lev 19:34 and also Lev 19:18 serve as reasonable base texts, and in fact could be intended simultaneously.

In sum, CD VI, 14-VII, 1 draws on HL material of Lev 19:18 and 34. The *gēr* appears as a brother when held up to either of these HL passages. In either case, the characters of the *gēr* and the brother become one and the same. Memories of loving the brother and the *gēr* conflate. The *gēr* of Lev 19:34 becomes the brother of CD VI, 20-21, and the *gēr* of CD VI, 21 becomes a brother also. The *gēr* is equivalent to a D movement “brother,” who is Israelite.

3 The rule for the assembly of all the camps: They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first, 4 the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the gēr fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names, 5 one after the other [lit. each one after his brother], the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel 6 third, and the gēr fourth.

CD XIV, 3-6 lists twice—once for the enlistment and once for the subsequent inscription of member names—the hierarchical order for those who are included within the rule of the assembly of all the camps: the priests first; the Levites second; the children of Israel third; and the gēr fourth. Katell Berthelot draws on the possible influence of Deut 29:9-11 [Eng. 10-12]:

You stand assembled today, all of you, before the LORD your God – the heads of your tribes, your elders, and your officials, all the men of Israel, 11 your children, your women, and your gēr who is within your camps; for cutting your trees or for drawing your water– 12 so that you will pass over into the covenant of the LORD your God. 18

It is the combined aspects of the list which include the gēr, in the singular as in CD XIV, 4 and 6, along with the reference to camps as in CD XIV, 3, that make the Deuteronomy passage significant. The added fact that the listed members in Deut 29:9-10 are entering into a covenant with God is also significant if compared to the camp members described in CD XIV, 3-6. These camp members have likewise entered into some sort of association together, whereby they shall each “inquire about any (matter)” (CD XIV, 6). Berthelot highlights the

18Berthelot, “La Notion de גָּר, ” 185. As a related observation, Cecilia Wassen suggests that Deut 29:10-12 also seems a close parallel to the initiation rite described in CD XV. Wassen, Women, 138. The possible relation to Deut 29:10-12 in CD XV strengthens the likelihood of the passage’s use also in CD XIV, since both columns are part of the Laws section of CD IX-XVI.
important point that in both these textual examples, the \textit{a priori} implication is that “the \textit{gēr} is a part of the camps.”\textsuperscript{19}

Regarding the fact that CD XIV, 3 refers to the “rule of the assembly of all the camps,” Berthelot turns to other passages in CD in which “camps” are referenced, citing in particular CD XIII, 20: “And this is the assembly of the camps for all the s[eed of Israel]” \(\text{וזה} \text{מושב המחנות לכל [זרע ישראל]}.\)\textsuperscript{20} If the assembly of the camps is the seed of Israel, then in some fashion the \textit{gēr} in CD is also a part of this seed of Israel. Berthelot posits that \(\text{זרע} \) must be understood in terms of “people” \((\text{עם})\) in this case, since the term in its majority scriptural sense can connote not only “seed” and “race” or “kinship,” but also a moral or religious category that has nothing to with biology.\textsuperscript{21} Thus she selects \(\text{זרע} \) as “people” without implications of shared kinship insofar as the \textit{gēr} is included within the people of Israel in a religious perspective (i.e., a perspective of common culture). However, Berthelot does not posit any ideas as to what the “brother” represents in this specific instance, an instance which is significant: CD XIV, 5 clearly intends each of these four entities of priest, Levite, Israelite and \textit{gēr} as a “brother,” because the categories are to be inscribed “one after the other” (lit. “each one after his brother”).

Therefore the question arises as to whether it is best to consider the \textit{gēr}, who is indeed included within the assembly of the camps, as a part of Israel’s seed of shared kinship, or simply as a person who is related to Israelites by common culture but not by kinship. Berthelot’s argument is reminiscent of the \textit{gēr} of the HL, who is not esteemed Judean yet must partake in all cultic practices. But CD XIV, 3-6 is rewritten from Deuteronomy and not

\textsuperscript{19}Berthelot, “La Notion de \(\textit{גֵּר}.\)” 185.
\textsuperscript{20}For this phrase, the text and translation which makes use of the \(\text{זרע} \) is preferred, in this case from Martinez and Tigchelaar, 2 vols. See Berthelot, “La Notion de \(\textit{גֵּר}.\)” 191. Berthelot observes that the reconstruction is possible due to the full word \(\text{זרע} \) being preserved in the manuscript parallels found within 4Q266, and also due to the similar phrasing of \(\text{זרע ישראל as found in CD XII, 22.}\)
\textsuperscript{21}Berthelot, “La Notion de \(\textit{גֵּר}.\)” 191–2. Berthelot draws on an example from Proverbs in which the “race of the righteous ones” \((\text{זרע צדיקים})\) is contrasted against that of the evil \((\text{רע}).\) (The verse in question is in fact Prov 11:21, and not 1:21 as noted on page 192.)
from the HL, wherein the regulations exist that make the resident alien ḡēr equal under the law with the ezrah, causing such a HL perspective to be unlikely. Another possible interpretation, which would result in the ḡēr representing an individual related by common culture but not by kinship, could be that this term represented a Gentile sympathizer of Judaism.  

Such a view is implied by Daniel Schwartz when he writes the following concerning the ḡēr’s separate registration in CD XIV, 3-6: “however welcome it might be that non-Israelites undertake to worship the Jewish God, and therefore associate themselves with a Jewish community, that cannot make them into Israelites, any more than cats can become dogs, even if they learn to bark.”  

Schwartz is implying that by the very fact that a ḡēr is not called an Israelite, this ḡēr is not Israelite. However, even though the ḡēr is not named an Israelite does not mean that he has not taken on Israelite kinship; instead, the use of the term could simply signal a lower hierarchical status. It seems highly unlikely that a Gentile sympathizer would be included within the Qumran movement, for reasons mentioned in the introductory chapter concerning the Qumran movement’s high level of social closure and existing regulations that legislate to keep away from Gentiles (e.g. CD XI, 14-15).

Overall, when one considers the above rebutted arguments, calling the ḡēr a “brother” seems suggestive of something more than merely a shared common culture. This ḡēr appears to share in Israelite kinship.

In summary, CD XIV, 3-6 draws on Deut 29:9-11’s reference to the inclusion of the ḡēr within the camps. CD proceeds to suggest innertextually that the “camps” are the seed of Israel. Furthermore, the ḡēr is identified as a brother, since the ḡēr is included in a list of

---

22 For an overview on Gentile sympathizers, sometimes known as “God-fearers” or “God-worshippers” and representing Gentile individuals that engaged in Judean practices such as Temple worship and association with Judean communities (but not circumcision), see the following: Kuhn, “προσηλύτης,” 731; Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 10; Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism,” Conservative Judaism 36, no. 4 (Summer 1983): 39. See also Josephus, Ant. 14. 110.  
24 See Ch. 4 of the present study concerning the ḡēr ranking lower in community hierarchy but nevertheless remaining a Gentile convert to Judaism, pp. 164-5.
figures who will be inscribed “each one after his bother.” The גֶּר, identified as both brother and seed of Israel, appears to share in Israelite kinship.

3.2.3 11QT⁸, 11QTemple Scroll, XL, 5-6

וַעֲשֵׂהֻתָּהּ שַׁלְיֵשׁ (מַעֲבֹדָה אֶת הָעַרֶרֶץ) וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא בָנוּוּ וַתּוּפָאָהּ הָעַרֶרֶץ וַתִּמָעַלָּה (פֶּרֶשְׁרֶל)

5 [ ] and you shall make a third courtyard [and surround the 6 central courtyard . . .] for their daughters and for גֶּרֶים, who were borne in Israel.

Where the גֶּר of TS is concerned, a number of interlocking textual comparisons may be made to not only majority scriptural material, but also to other scriptural rewriting within the DSS, and even innertextually within TS itself.

Among current comparisons drawn between TS and majority scriptural predecessors, not all prove to be accurate. Connections have been made between TS and 4QFlor 4Q174, the latter of which was discerned in the previous chapter to denote an eschatological Temple.²⁵ Literary parallels drawn between TS and 4Q174, for example, that both simply make mention of a גֶּר, have been used to suggest that the Temple described in TS is also eschatological, as is the Temple in 4Q174.²⁶ However, TS appears to describe a future,

²⁵See Ch. 2 of the present study, section 2.3.3.2.
²⁶Michael Wise suggests that “the redactor intended the TS as an eschatological law for the land.” He forms this conclusion regarding an eschatological nature of the scroll primarily on the basis of possible connections, made by George Brooke, between TS and 4QFlor 4Q174, the latter of which has been established to represent an end-times Temple (whether that be a “sanctuary of men” or a physical building). However, Wise proceeds to contradict these very “connections.” He establishes that of the eleven textual connections made by Brooke between the two texts, “some are not very remarkable.” Of the “more persuasive” connections, Wise identifies the very presence of the term “גֶּר” between TS and 4Q174 to be one. Wise suggests thus because at the time he published his monograph, only the גֶּר of 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 4; CD VI, 21 and XIV, 4-6; and 11QT⁸ XL, 6 were known. As the present study demonstrates, in fact thirteen confirmed occasions exist of the גֶּר in DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting, if one includes the CD occurrences as verified by the close overlap with the 4QD manuscripts. Chapter 2 demonstrated that the term גֶּר occurs in a variety of contexts and also in texts correlated with the traditions of D as well as S, and the presence of the term does not in and of itself suggest a shared connection between texts. This means that TS need not represent something eschatological just because that is the case where 4Q174 is concerned. See Michael Owen Wise, A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from
eschatological Temple only in 11QT\textsuperscript{a} XXIX, 8-10, which is separate from the Temple primarily referenced in TS. The Temple primarily discussed in TS is rendered as ideal and contemporary, not eschatological.\textsuperscript{27} One finds support for this point of view in Schiffman’s argument that many of the laws in TS (such as the Laws of the King) speak out against the “existing order” and call for radical change in the time period contemporary to TS.\textsuperscript{28} Nothing suggests that TS must be referring to an eschatological era. Rather, the third courtyard for daughters and for \textit{gērīm} in Israel is construed in an era, albeit idealized, that is contemporary to the Qumran movement. The two Temples of TS and 4Q174 are not the same and should not be compared for similarities as to the meaning of the \textit{gēr}.

Because connections to 4Q174 are unfounded, other passages connected to the \textit{gēr} of 11QT\textsuperscript{a} XL, 6 must be sought instead. Deut 23:9 [Eng 8] serves as a likely predecessor, and the comparison of these two texts highlights between them a different interpretation of \textit{gērīm}.\textsuperscript{29} Deut 23:8-9 [7-8] discusses who is to be included or excluded from the assembly (\textit{קהל}) of the LORD, implying the Temple. The passage regulates that the children of the third generation of Egyptians may enter the assembly of YHWH, the motivation being that the Israelites had been resident aliens (\textit{gērīm}) in Egypt. By way of comparison between Deuteronomy and TS, Deut 23:9 reads of “children who are born to them of the third generation” (ךסם אֲשֶׁרּ חָדרוֹ חֵד חֶד לְ יהוָה), and 11QT\textsuperscript{a} XL, 6 discusses entrance into the third courtyard of “\textit{gērīm} who were born” (וֹלְגָרִים אֲשֶׁר נוֹלְגָרִים). One notes the symbolic connection between a “third” generation and a “third” courtyard. In addition, the reference to \textit{gērīm} in 11QT\textsuperscript{a} XL, 6 serves as allusion to the Israelites as \textit{gērīm} in Egypt in Deut 23:8-9.

However, TS makes a clear distinction from Deuteronomy in two ways. First, the \textit{gērīm}
described in TS are born in Israel. There is no mistaking them with a foreigner from another land, nor even with Israelites who lived in Egypt. Second, the gēr is present with daughters (as in, Judean women) in the same courtyard. Based on various purity regulations within TS which stipulate to keep clear of Gentiles and not do as Gentiles do, it would not make sense to include a resident alien, who is a “Gentile,” in the same Temple courtyard as with Judean women. Instead of utilizing the term gērîm to refer to resident aliens, referencing the “gērîm who were born” offers a form of textual substitution for the “children who are born.” Furthermore, Donaldson observes that all those who enter the Temple, regardless of the courtyard, are referred to as “the children of Israel” (בני ישראל) in 11QTa XLVI, 7-8. This observation that gērîm substitute for children, who textually are now solely the children of Israel, would imply that at least where these particular daughters and gērîm are concerned, they are included as Israelites.

While this chapter endeavours primarily to study the gēr as he appears within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, 11QTa provides the situation whereby one must also consider occasions of the gēr in absentia. Michael Wise demonstrates that within rewritten Deuteronomic passages of TS, the gēr is omitted when he must clearly be understood as a resident alien due to context. The parallel to Deut 14:21 in 11QTa XLVIII, 6-7 serves as an example. This passage describes the treatment of the carcass of an animal that has died on its own. The relevant excerpt from Deut 14:21 reads: “You shall not eat anything that dies of

30 For example, 11QTa XLVIII, 1-14, which commands not to bury the dead anywhere as do Gentiles; LVI, 15, which commands not to set a foreigner as king; LVII, 2-11, which commands that the king shall be protected from capture by foreign nations; and LXII, 13-16 which commands the ban on Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Hivites, Jebusites, Gergasites, and Perizzites, so that they cannot teach concerning their gods. Moreover, a Gentile is kept to a separate court from women in Tannaitic literature, further lending to the unlikely situation that a woman and a Gentile would be placed in the same courtyard in 11QTa. For example, see Cana Werman’s discussion concerning the overlap between Second Temple and Tannaitic literature on degrees of holiness and division. Cana Werman, “The Price of Mediation: The Role of Priests in the Priestly Halakhah,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008) (ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), esp. 386, 405.
31 Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 208. Donaldson refers to XLIV, 7-8, but XLVI, 7-8, is the passage intended.
itself, to the resident alien (gēr) who is in your gates you may give it so that he may eat it, or sell (it) to a foreigner (nokrî), for you are a holy people to the LORD your God.” Even if one lifted the passage out of its preexilic or exilic setting, the gēr could only be construed as a resident alien in this passage. If the gēr was a convert, he too, would be prohibited from eating the carcass. 11QTa XLVIII, 6-7 parallels the Deuteronomy passage, except for the reference to the gēr, which is now absent: “You shall not eat the carcass of any winged thing or animal, but may sell it to a foreigner (nokrî). And any abominable thing you shall not eat, for you are a people holy to the Lord [LORD] your God.” The question to now consider will be TS’s reasons for omitting the gēr from these Deuteronomy rewrites.

When the two examples are considered together, namely the gēr that is identified in 11QTa XL, 5-6 and the gēr that is now absent from 11QTa XLVIII, 6-7, a pattern emerges. It appears that the gēr is omitted from the text when the term can only be construed as a resident alien, and that the gēr is present in the text when representing a Judean convert who is now a member of the movement. Wise concludes that these converts are only welcome to enter the primary Temple of TS, a Temple which he deems to be eschatological. However, the present study considers TS to represent a contemporary Temple. The gēr is omitted from the text solely when he can only ever be construed as a resident alien, and the gēr of 11QTa XL, 5-6 is included as a Gentile convert to Judaism in the idealized “contemporary” Temple, due to his nature as a child of Israel.

In sum, 11QTa, XL, 5-6 includes a gēr in a third courtyard with women, and is a passage based loosely on the Temple exclusions until the third generation within Deut 23:8-9. The gēr appears to be recognized as a Judean proselyte in the idealized contemporary time of TS, as opposed to some sort of eschatological time in the future. The gēr is also “absent” from the Deuteronomy rewrite of 11QTa XLVIII, 6-7, where the text does not want to confuse the readership by using a term which means a Judean proselyte, in a context
borrowing from Deut 14:21 which implies a resident alien. Furthermore, this gēr was specifically “born in Israel.” In TS, the gēr as a convert shares in Israelite kinship.

3.2.4 4Q377, 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B, Frag. 1, I

A number of majority scriptural predecessors have already been identified within 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B 4Q377. Nevertheless, investigating pertinent themes within the column fragment as a whole through the lens of bricolage will prove helpful. In so doing, a variety of charted and as yet uncharted predecessors drawn from majority scripture become apparent, whose usage demonstrate the express purpose of creating a document with a new and identifiable theme. This theme is that the people of this sectarian movement will find themselves in a new land, which is a land of promise and honey. Ariel Feldman suggests that the whole of Fragment 1 contains a theme pertaining to a “Promise of the Land.”

of the reworked parts transforms this promise, and the specifics of this land, into something different than the land of Canaan promised by Moses to the Israelites.

Line 2, as suggested by Vanderkam and Brady, may “point to the Sinai revelations,” if is an expression taken and reworked from Exod 24:10, in which the ground under the God of Israel’s feet is described as “something like a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heavens (of clearness.)” This line introduces the Exodus sentiment of the text.

A number of textual allusions call to mind a notion of land and land inheritance. Line 4 appears to be an allusion to Prov 8:21, Isa 49:8, or both, with the use of the infinitive construct form “to give as a possession,” or “to cause to inherit” (לְהַנַּחַל). In Prov 8:21, this form is found in the context of personified Wisdom promising “to give those who love me substance as a possession” (…)לְהַנַּחַל). In Isa 49:8, this infinitive construct form is found within the context of YHWH’s identified salvation. Isa 49:8 reads as follows: “Thus says the LORD, ‘In a time of favour I have answered you (2ms), and on a day of salvation I have helped you; I have kept you and given you as a covenant people; to cause to stand land, to give desolate ones inheritances as a possession (לְהַנַּחַל).’” An allusion to an inheritance of a “lot of land,” such as the distribution of land by lot described in Joshua 18, may also correlate with the noun from this same root נחל. In addition, this allusion to the inheritance of a “lot” is reminiscent of 4QFour Lots 4Q279’s reference to lots distributed to the four categories of Aaronide priests, Levites, children of Israel, and gērîm, denoting a hierarchical list of members who share in kinship (from the root יחַש, spelled (יחש)).

VanderKam and Brady offer a number of possibilities from majority scripture that could serve as predecessors to line 6, where various figures, including the gēr, are juxtaposed

35 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 207. See also the comment for line 2 on p. 209.
for adjudication: “and I [will judge] be[tw]een a man and his friend, between a father and his son, and between a man and [his] gēr [ ]”. Passages that resemble this phrase “between such-and-such” include Exod 18:16; Num 30:17; Deut 1:16; and Jer 7:5. A variant of Num 30:17 has also been quoted in another text belonging to the Qumran movement, namely CD VII, 8-9. Of the above passages, a combination of Exod 18:16 along with Deut 1:16 offer the closest parallels to line 6. In Exod 18:16, Moses explains how he resolves disputes: “I judge between a man and his friend” (וָּשִּׁהְ הָאִישׁ אֵישׁוֹ לֹא). But what about “between a father and his son, and between a man and his gēr”? In Deut 1:16 Moses reminisces to the people on his prior words that “you (2mp) shall judge rightly between a man, his brother, and his gēr” (בּוֹרֵי אֵישׁ אֵישׁוֹ וְאֵישׁוֹ לֹא). This passage matches the phenomenon of a gēr with a 3ms pronominal suffix, as in the 4Q377 passage. However, the reference in Deut 1:16 to “a man and his brother” does not match the 4Q377 passage, and Deut 1:16 contains no reference to a father and his son as does 4Q377. 4QInst & 4Q423, Frag. 5, 4 contains the phrase that he will “visit upon fathers and sons, (using a lamed of specification), upon gērîm together with every native born” (יפקודם עם כל אזרחים [גרים] לאבות ובנים ל). Making such a connection is not intended to suggest that 4Q377 is necessarily making a direct reuse of 4Q423, but merely that it is only in 4Q423 where one finds a similar-minded turn of phrase regarding the side-by-side paralleling of “a father to his son.” Thus line 6 conflates Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16, and is reminiscent of 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4. The reference from Deut 1:16 to a brother has been omitted but the reference to the gēr remains. Identifying these scriptural predecessors will prove helpful in determining the nature of the gēr, in particular this omission of the “brother”: the omission of

---

38 The excerpt from CD VII, 7-9 reads as follows: “then they shall walk according to the Torah vacat and the precept 8 established according to the rule of the Torah, and he said, “Between a man and his wife and between a father 9 and his son” (בין איש אישה ובין אב לבנו). The Num 30:17 [Eng. 16] passage differs in that it stipulates “between a man to his wife; between a father to his daughter” instead of between a father to his son, as in CD VII, 8-9.
39 While textually similar, the referent in 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4 is likely YHWH and not Moses, which is the case with Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16.
the brother erases any differentiation between a gēr and a brother, as was the case in Deut 1:16.

These two majority scripture passages in which Moses is the speaker contrast in one way against 4Q377. VanderKam and Brady suggest that the legible phrase in line 3, “my righteousness to the eyes of all” (צדקתי לינון כלים), is reminiscent of Psalm 98:2 “The LORD has made known his salvation, for the eyes of the nations he has revealed his righteousness” (נותנתי י镀锌 לโน בלאים). The substitution in suffix from that of the 3ms found in the Psalm, to the 1cs observed in 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 3, suggests that God is the speaker in 4Q377. Because Moses is only addressed in the third person within the rest of 4Q377, in particular Frag. 2, I and II, God, and not Moses, is likely the first person speaker in Frag 1, I, 6. If so, God takes over the voice of Moses from Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16. Such a literary move erases time. No longer do readers in 4Q377 see themselves under Moses’ direction as the Israelites wandering in the desert after being released from Pharaoh’s grip, nor as the Israelites upon the threshold of entering the promised land. Instead, readers are on the threshold of entering a promised land that is new and different.

Line 8 strengthens the message of a promised land in 4Q377. This list of the nations who will be driven out from the land (the Hivite, the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Jebusite, the Girgashite, הכנעני החתי האמורי הירמית found an appropriate predecessor in Exod 34:11, or also Exod 3:8 (Exod 3:8 also features in line 9). Other similar series of nations exist within majority scripture but since 4Q377 clearly refashions themes from the Exodus delivery from Egypt, this Sinai passage is the best fit. While the Girgashites are missing from MT Exod 34:11 and Exod 3:8, VanderKam and Brady note that they can be

40 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea*, Part 2, 209.
41 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea*, Part 2, 209, Comments line 3; see also p. 207.
42 VanderKam and Brady comment on the differences between 4Q377 *Apocryphal Pentateuch B* and 4Q368 *Apocryphal Pentateuch A*, which stem primarily from the fact that 4Q368 displays Moses talking with God and 4Q377 does not. VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea*, Part 2, 207–8.
found within the parallel verses found in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint.\textsuperscript{43} The Perizzites, a nation named among those lists in Exod 3:8 and 34:11, are missing from line 8, and VanderKam and Brady suggest that they could potentially be located within the traces of remnant letters at the end of the line.\textsuperscript{44} Regardless of whether Perizzites are present in the text or not, line 8 strongly resembles Exod 34:11 and 3:8, which deal with a divine gift of land, intended for one group of individuals. Furthermore, the \textit{gēr} is a part of this group of included individuals, and is not among those foreigners who represent excluded nations.

Finally, line 9 completes the theme of securing a land, a land which by now is known to be separated in time from that land Moses secured. The line’s clear words “better and wider” (вшись הרחבות) are derived from Exod 3:8, in which YHWH says: “And I have come down to deliver them (literally, “it” with a 3ms suffix, referring to “my people” in Exod 3:7) from the hand of Egypt, and to bring them up from that land, \textit{to a land better and wider}, (=all registrado טוּבֶת ורָחֶב) to a land flowing with milk and honey, to the place of the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Perrizite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite.” 4Q377 reworks existing texts which call to mind the promised land of Canaan, while simultaneously transferring the voice of Moses into the voice of YHWH. The result is the allusion of being brought to a new land of honey, a land that is separate in time and space for a new community.

In summary, 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 6 contains a reference to a \textit{gēr} which is borrowed from Deut 1:16, but is placed into a unique framework in which Deut 1:16’s reference to the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{43}VanderKam and Brady, \textit{Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII}: Miscellanea, Part 2, 210. In addition, Exod 33:2 offers another close parallel listing of excluded nations, also only missing the Gergashites. However, the Septuagint version adds the Gergashites but is missing the Canaanites.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{44}VanderKam and Brady comment that the end of the line contains “traces of perhaps five letters.” VanderKam and Brady, \textit{Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII}: Miscellanea, Part 2, 209, Comments line 8. Having had opportunity to see one of the initial infrared photographs of this fragment, I conclude the word would have to be within the missing space just after the Gergashites, if it is present. While there are remnants of about five, or more likely six, letters at the end of the line, the first two are indecipherable, the third shows an upper horizontal stroke that could belong to either a \textit{he} or a \textit{lamed}, the fourth looks like a \textit{yod} (which could represent either a \textit{yod} or a \textit{vav} in this document), the fifth looks very much like a medial \textit{kaph}, and the final ink blur is indecipherable. Unfortunately, there is no distinguishable \textit{pe} of הפרזי, and the word appears to not be borrowed from either contexts of Exod 3:8 nor 34:11. Thus a reading of כتدخل is suggested as a replacement to that reading of VanderKam and Brady’s at the end of line 8.}
brother is omitted, and a reference to a father and son is added (as in 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4), alongside Exod 18:16’s reference to a friend. The result is that the gēr is no longer differentiated from a brother as was the case in Deut 1:16, and could thus be a brother himself. The gēr is also included within the group that will replace the Amorite, Canaanite, Hittite, Perizzite, Hivite and Jebusite, who are the nations to be driven out of the land in Exod 3:8 and 34:11. The new land, in which the gēr is now a part, is not the land described in Exodus, but is rather a future-oriented new land of honey in a new time and space. Furthermore, it is God who speaks of the inheritance of this land of honey, narrated through the memory of the Exodus Sinaitic adjudicating voice of Moses, and observed in the change of voice in Psalm 98:2. The promised inheritance is evident through allusions to Prov 8:21 and Isa 49:8. The act of separating Moses from his voice takes the land to a new place, for a new time and a new people, within which the gēr is an included figure. That the gēr is both present in the text without the contrasting presence of the term “brother,” and is also included in the promise of land, suggests his identity as a “brother” who is Israelite in the Qumran movement.

3.2.5 4Q159, 4QOrdinances Frags. 2-4, 1-3

1 And if [ . . . to a] gēr or the offspring of the family[y of a gēr . . . ]
2 in the presence of Isr[ael.] They [may no]t serve non-Jews. With a zr[. . . ]
3 Egypt and he commanded them not to be sold in a transaction of slavery.

Chapter 1 confirmed that 4QOrd Frags. 2-4, 1-3 is generally a reworking of the manumission text (rights of slavery redemption) of Lev 25:47-55. A number of omissions have been made. 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1 opens with a variant of the second half of Lev 25:47: “And (if) he sells himself to a gēr tōshāb with you or to the descendant of a gēr family”
It is clear that 4Q159 deals with the part of the Levitical passage which concerns an Israelite in indentured slavery. Schiffman observes that the compound noun “גֶּר תֹּשָׁב” in Lev 25:47 changes to the solo reference to the “גֶּר” in 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1, and identifies this shift as that used similarly in rabbinic texts to denote the shift in meaning of the גֶּר from that of “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism.”

4Q159 then skips over the manumission rules of Lev 25:48 through 52, and picks up in lines 2 and 3 with allusions to Lev 25:53 and possibly Lev 25:55. Line 2 does not proceed with Lev 25:48, which regulates that the Israelite shall have the right of redemption after selling himself. Instead, line 2 contains the phrase “in the presence of Israel,” lit. “before the eyes of Israel.” Lev 25:53 contains a similarly-minded phrase “in your sight” (לעיני ישראל). The beginning of line 3 has a reference to “Egypt” (מצרים), calling to mind the phrase “from the land of Egypt” (מארץ מצרים), located in Lev 25:55. The manumission reinterpretation ends in line 3 by circling back to the concluding command of Lev 25:42 not to sell Israelites as permanent slaves.

How do these omissions affect the meaning of the גֶּר included within 4Q159?

Included within the omissions from Lev 25:47-52 is the reference within v. 47 “and your brother becomes poor” (חיוך והמך), along with the reference within v. 48 to the right of redemption for the Israelite by “one from among his brothers” (חיו לך אחיך). The space in 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1 that contains whatever words are missing between the ואם and the גֶּר is not lengthy enough to contain anything more than at most, something along the lines of what has been proposed by Francis Weinert, namely "וַיִּהְפֶּר ("and if he becomes

---

45See the discussion on the matter in the Introduction of the present study, section 1.1.2 and n. 50.
46Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 271.
47Simultaneously, this reference to Egypt could be borrowed from Deut 5:15 or 26:8: the בזר of line 2 leading up to the vacat and subsequent reference to Egypt has been recognized by Weinert and Schiffman as “with an [outstretched] arm and a mighty hand he brought them out of the land of 3 Egypt” (וביד חזקה הוציא אותם מארץ מצרים), Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 184; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 155, n. 31.
impoverished”\textsuperscript{49}. Such a required abbreviation of Lev 25:47 confirms the omission of the reference to “your brother.” Concerning Lev 25:48, the entire verse, with its reference to an Israelite’s redemption by a brother, is omitted. The omitted references to a “brother” strip away any differentiation between the Israelite man of 4Q159 who presumably sells himself, and the \textit{gēr}. A \textit{gēr} was clearly differentiated from a “brother” in Lev 25:47-48, leaving it clear that the \textit{gēr} was in no way a brother. The omission of the term “brother” could have taken place because the \textit{gēr} in 4Q159 is understood to be a “brother,” and differentiation between a brother and a \textit{gēr} is no longer desired. In addition, 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 2 adds an additional stipulation that “[t]hey (meaning the Israelites who sell themselves into indentured slavery) [may no]t serve non-Jews (םבניאים).” Meanwhile, however, it is evident in line 1 that the impoverished Israelite is selling himself to a \textit{gēr}. It seems unlikely that the Gentile and the \textit{gēr} would be synonymous, in this case, since an indentured slave would likely directly serve the one to whom he sold himself. If the \textit{gēr} was a Gentile, i.e. a “resident alien,” the “Israelite” would indeed be serving a “non-Jew,” thus breaking the very regulation noted. In sum, Levitical brother references, intended to differentiate this \textit{gēr} from being himself regarded as a “brother,” have been omitted. The omission likely occurred precisely because the \textit{gēr} is understood to be a “brother” in 4Q159. Certainly, the text makes it plain that the \textit{gēr} is no longer a Gentile. This leaves only one outcome, namely that the \textit{gēr} of 4Q159 is a “brother” who is not a Gentile, but is instead Israeliite, like other members of the group.

In sum, Frags. 2-4, 1-3 uses text manipulation strategies of both omissions and also additions on the manumission passage of Leviticus 25. This passage from 4Q159 begins with a variant of Lev 25:47, and proceeds to Lev 25:53 as well as Lev 25:55. In this rewritten passage, brother references in Lev 25:47-48 are omitted, and while \textit{goyim} and \textit{gēr} are not looked upon as synonymous entities within Lev 25:44-45,\textsuperscript{50} 4Q159 adds a prohibition


\textsuperscript{50}The fact that \textit{goyim} and \textit{gēr} represent different entities within Lev 25:44-45 is also noted by Berthelot and Hamidović. Berthelot, “La Notion de “ג,”” 182; Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 271.
regarding serving the gôy to emphasize this distinction. In the context of Leviticus, the gēr represents a resident alien, and the gôy represents a foreign nation. The present study concludes that within the context of 4Q159, the added distinction implies that if the gēr is not a Gentile, then he should in fact be an “Israelite.” The gēr now represents a convert and the gôy represents someone who is still a Gentile individual. Thus, no difference in kinship exists between the gēr and the Israelite selling himself in 4Q159. In other words, there is nothing with which to negate this gēr from having become an Israelite brother. The fact that the gēr tôshab of Lev 25:47 is reduced to solely a gēr, understood to represent the distinction between resident alien and proselyte within rabbinc literature, confirms that the gēr is a Gentile who has undergone a kinship conversion to become an “Israelite” brother. The gēr’s “Israelite” nature is understood to match that of other members within the D tradition of the Qumran movement.

3.2.6 4Q279, 4QFour Lots, Frag. 5, 1-6

1 [   ] his [fe]llow who is inscribed after [ him   ]
2 [   ] his [____], and greatness of pedigree (is) upon him, and th[u]s [   ].
3 [   ] And for the priests, the sons of Aaron, shall go out the [first] lot [   ]
4 [   ] a man according to his spirit. And the [second] lo[t   ]
5 [   ] and] the fourth lot for the gēr[im   ]

Textual predecessors to 4QFour Lots 4Q279 exist within both scriptural rewriting in the DSS as well as majority scripture. It has been established that the list in 4Q279 Frag. 5 is likely similar to that list within CD XIV, 3-6, referring to priests, Levites, children of Israel, and the
4Q279 designates a lot (גּוֹרֶל) for each of the listed entities. The “lot” may represent an apportioning of light in a person’s spirit, based on the interrelationship to lots identified in other texts pertaining to the Qumran movement, such as 1QS II, 2; II, 4-5; 1QM I, 5; XIII, 5; and CD XIII, 12. In majority scriptural predecessors, the lot refers to “a division of the land in the sense of ‘lot.’” Num 36:2 directly relates inheritance as a lot of land: “The LORD commanded my lord to give the land for inheritance by lot (רָאקְשְׁאָלִים בֵּין דְּנָנֵים) to the Israelites.” While 4Q279’s distribution of an inherited lot of land for the children of Israel is customary based on majority scriptural predecessors, the distribution of lots to Aaronite priests, Levites, and gērîm is very unusual. Numbers 18:20 assigns holy offerings to Aaronite priests instead of land allotment. Furthermore, in Deut 26:11, Levites and gērîm have to be specifically included during the festival of first fruits and tithes, precisely because neither of them was included in the gift of land inheritance. This means that within 4Q279 Frag. 5, it is unusual that the “lot,” in its Pentateuchal relationship to “inheritance” usually designated for Israelites, is also attributed to Aaronite priests, Levites, and gērîm.

51If 4Q279 Frag. 5, 1-6 is borrowing from CD XIV, 3-6, as was suggested in Chapter 2, this secondary status could explain 4Q279’s plural gērîm (versus the singular gēr in CD XIV). It was established that CD XIV keeps the gēr in the singular because of the singular nature of the gēr in CD XIV’s majority scriptural predecessor, Deut 29:9-11. As a work that is borrowing from CD XIV, but no longer Deut 29:9-11, the authors of 4Q279 may have written all entries (Aaronite priests, Levites, children of Israel, and gērîm) in the plural for the sake of consistency. Nevertheless, a Deuteronomical sentiment lingers, especially in the joint reference to Levites and gērîm (see below).

52von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch, 82.

53Recall that the self-designated terms “sons of Aaron,” “sons of Zadok,” and Levites are not esteemed historical references with regard to positions filled and services performed at the Jerusalem Temple. This terminology is instead added to show legitimacy and hierarchy within the Qumran movement. See the section that revisits scholarly debate concerning a Qumran movement “Zadokite priesthood,” as well as the section that investigates the provenance and dating of 4Q279, in Ch. 2 of the present study, sections 2.1.1 and 2.3.2.5, respectively.

54Num 18:20 excludes Aaronite priests from a portion of land (described as a קָנָן), because instead YHWH is their inheritance and their portion. Levites were not granted land as they were instead set aside to perform tabernacle/Temple duties (Num 3:5-51; 34:16-35:8). Passages that describe the exclusion of Levites from receiving land or inheritance (described as קָנָן קְנָן) include the following: Deut 10:9; 12:12; 14:27; and 18:1. Joshua 21 describes the alternate allotment of towns and livestock pasture lands to be set aside for the Levites. See von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch, 82. Gērîm were understood as resident aliens and thus could not own land as could Israelites. Deut 16:14 and 26:11-12 describe sharing produce and first fruits tithes with socially and economically-depressed individuals; the resident alien gēr is included among such individuals, presumably because of his lack of an allotment of land. As was seen with 4Q423, Ezek 47:22-23 does not make a fitting majority scriptural predecessor. In the case of 4Q279, the combined Pentateuchal allusions to Aaronites, Levites, and gērîm, make the likes of the passages described above more likely predecessors.
Therefore in 4Q279 the text simultaneously inverts and conflates majority scriptural predecessors, such as Num 36:2 that describes a promise of an inheritance of land by lot for Israelites, combined with Num 18:20 and Deut 26:11, which set apart Aaronide priests, Levites and gērim because they will not receive any land. Instead, Aaronide priests, Levites, and gērim are each accepting a lot of their own. The reference to the lot takes 4Q279 even a step further than CD XIV in its inclusion of the gēr, due to the lot’s allusions to land and Israelite inheritance, and consequently, to the gēr’s consideration as an “Israelite.” The additional reference within 4Q279 that the hierarchical ordering of the lots is structured according to one’s “greatness of pedigree” suggests a connection of shared kinship between the Aaronide priests, the Levites, the Israelites, and the gērim. Presumably this connection is the key to the Pentateuchal inversion, and suggests an appropriate interpretation concerning the change of the gēr in 4Q279 from one who was a guest at the festival celebration as a non-Israelite, into one who is now a part of the Israelite—presumably representing the Qumran movement—hierarchy, albeit fourth on the list. While the hierarchical listing has been used to argue the status of a gēr as non-Israelite and nonproselyte, it is now clear that a hierarchical separation in which a gēr is listed separately from other Israelite categories need not negate his existence as Israelite/Judean. Despite Jutta Jokiranta’s resistance to calling the gēr a “convert,” just as she has observed, the gēr’s low hierarchical ranking does not preclude his full membership in the Qumran movement. This gēr shares in land and kinship with other members of the movement.

55Hamidović suggests the gērim of 4Q279 are not excluded, but neither are they assimilated as Israelites. It appears, however, that he argues against an Israelite kinship for the gēr merely for the reason that the “gērim” are listed separately from “Israelites.” Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 287.
56See Introduction chapter, section 1.2.1.8.
3.3 Texts Correlated with the Serek (S) Tradition

3.3.1 4Q169, 4QNahum Pesher Frags. 3-4, II, 7-10

In the case of 4QpNah 4Q169, even though Frags. 3-4, II, 7-9 start with the reference to Nah 3:4 and describe a sex worker who misleads nations and families, the interpretation which follows only loosely hearkens to a similar list of those misdirected. The meaning of the gēr as a member of this list relates directly to whatever meaning is established regarding the other characters in the passage, with whom the gēr is likened. Further time spent in innertextual comparison is required before moving on to discovering other majority scripture allusions or rewritings.

Chapter 2 equated “Ephraim” with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, who were identified with the Pharisees.57 A necessary subsequent step is to establish the identity of those misdirected figures, listed in 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, II, 9, among whom the gēr is included. According to Shani Berrin, the syntax should be understood as follows: the “kings, princes, priests and people together with the gēr” are “best understood as referring to adherents of the Pharisees”; “cities and families” are unclear but also most likely refer to those adherents of the Pharisees “who were misled”; and “nobles and rulers” would “represent the opponents of

57See Ch. 2 of the present study, section 2.3.3.1.
the Pharisees.”58 In this interpretation of the syntax, the gēr represents someone who is an adherent of the Pharisees. Hamidović concurs with this interpretation: “the לוח seems also to have been susceptible to Pharisaic teachings. It is the indication also of participation on the part of the לוח in the debates that spanned Judaism; this figure does not rest neutrally, [instead] he participates in the life of the society.”59 Yonder Moynihan Gillihan has likewise observed that this gēr does not represent a member of the Qumran movement, but rather “a victim of liars,”60 meaning that the gēr has fallen pray to the teachings of a group whose views the authors of 4Q169 oppose. Therefore it appears evident that the gēr is connected in some way to the Pharisaic group of kings, princes, priests and people.

Now that the gēr is identified as one who participates as a follower of the Pharisees, textual predecessors from majority scripture can be sought out to further identify this figure. Most revealing is the use of the verb לוח in the niphal in Frags. 3-4, II, 9 to describe “people together with the gēr,” ועם עם גehr נלוה. This use of לוח along with the gēr calls to mind Isa 14:1.61 Isa 14:1 reads as follows: “But the LORD will have compassion (on) Jacob and he will choose again Israel and he will set them upon their land; and the gēr will be joined upon them (ועם עם גehr נלוה) and they will be united with the house of Jacob.” This verse is considered to be a Persian era insertion into First Isaiah (Isa 1-39), itself generally assigned to the eighth century B.C.E. Scholarship’s choice in dating for Isa 14:1 has been established in particular by the very use of the Second Temple period verb לוח, “to attach oneself” or “to join oneself,” usually used in the niphal.62

Much debate surrounds the meaning of the verb לוח in Second Temple period literature. In addition to the simple notion of attaching or joining oneself to something,

59Hamidović, “À la Frontière,” 275.
61Berthelot, “La Notion de לוח,” 186.
numerous scholars have postulated this verb to implicate an act of conversion within later Second Temple literature in such passages as Est 9:27; Isa 14:1; 56:3, 6; Jer 50:5; Zech 2:15; Dan 11:34; Jdt 14:10; and Tob 1:8. On the other hand, John Lübbe argues against an intended implication of “conversion”:

lawah has no inherent religious meaning in these references, nor even in the occurrences of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah, which specify Yahweh as the one with whom Gentiles will associate (Isa. 14:1; 56:3, 6; Jer. 50:5; Zech 2:15). For if we place a restraint on multiplying meanings unnecessarily, then it is possible to find a single meaning for all occurrences of lawah in Niphal, viz. that lawah simply describes an act of association, in which a person chose to unite himself to another.

Lübbe’s concept of “association” seems to run along the lines of the gēr within the Persian era HL, where the gēr is not Israelite and yet follows Torah to stay in the land. Certainly one may argue that an act of ethnic conversion, which would include a conversion of the features of “religion” as a part of common culture, only took effect in the Hellenistic period. Thus, with regard to the above-mentioned scripture passages of the Second Temple period, the verb will allude to either a conversion or to a general “uniting” as described by Lübbe, depending on the dating of each text. Isa 14:1 has been dated to Judea’s Persian, pre-Hellenistic era.

In the case of 4Q169 in particular, what would it mean for someone to “join” with others in the way of life of the Pharisees? Katell Berthelot considers the choice of verb לוה in 4Q169 to indicate that the gēr “must also be accountable to God,” meaning that the gēr must “be associated with Israel for religious matters.” In making this statement, Berthelot implies that the gēr is not actually a Gentile convert to Judaism. However, since it has been

63 For example, see any of the following: Kidd, Alterity and Identity, 72; Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 42, 207; Steven S. Tuell, “The Priesthood of the ‘Foreigner’: Evidence of Competing Politics in Ezekiel 44:1–14 and Isaiah 56:1–8,” in Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr. (ed. John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 193–4. In texts in which we find a Greek rendering of the Hebrew verb לוה, to indicate some kind of transferal to the Israelite nation (namely Judith, which is composed in Greek, and Tobit, for which there is no extant Hebrew manuscript available for our verse of interest 1:8), the Greek verb προσκειµαι is used.
64 Lübbe, “Exclusion of the Ger,” 178. Jer 50:5, contrary to Lübbe’s argument, suggests that people of Israel and Judah, and not Gentiles, are “joining” with YHWH.
65 Berthelot, “La Notion de לוה,” 186.
discerned that the *gēr* can participate in the realm of Judaic debate, surely the *gēr* has a more intimate relationship with Judaism than merely being associated with Israel for religious (cultic) matters like the *gēr* of the HL. Because 4Q169 dates well within the realm of Hellenistic influence and the era of permitted conversions within Judaism, a meaning of a Pharisaic convert for the *gēr* in this text seems more likely.

In conclusion, the *gēr* in 4Q169 finds himself in a list, loosely expanded upon from Nah 3:4, of those who have been misdirected by a Pharisaic group that stands in opposition to the *pesher*’s sectarian authors. Furthermore, the *gēr* is attached, in the manner of the *gēr* of Isa 14:1, to this group of misdirected individuals, suggesting that the *gēr* is able to closely follow the practices of that group. Finally, because of the Hellenistic era date of the passage and the influence of ethnic conversions that era brought with it, the verb מָלְכָּה takes on a meaning of “convert,” which applies to the *gēr*. Based on these observations it seems that the *gēr* serves as a Gentile convert to Pharisaic Judaism in this text.

### 3.3.2 4Q174, *4QFlorilegium*, Frag. 1, I, 1-4

1 . . .] enemy [. . . ‘And] the son of wickedness [shall no more afflict] him as at first, and as from the day that  
2 [I commanded judges] (to be) over my people Israel’—that is the house which [. . . in] the end of days, as it is written in the book of  
3 [. . . ‘The sanctuary, O Lord, which] thy hands have [es]tablished. YHWH will rule for ever and ever.’ That is the house ‘where there shall never more enter  
4 [. . .] and ‘the Ammonite and the Moabite’ and ‘illegitimate child’ and ‘foreigner’ and *gēr* ‘for ever’, for my holy ones are there.

*4QFlorilegium* reinterprets several scriptural texts. The two predecessors with regard to the *gēr* in Frag. 1, I, 1-4 are Ezek 44:9 and Deut 23:3-4. Those figures who will be excluded

---

66Recall the date assigned to 4Q169 is the mid-first century B.C.E. See the section on 4Q169 in Ch. 2 of the present study, section 2.3.3.1.
from the eschatological house (Temple),\textsuperscript{67} which will be established in the last days, are a conflation of those who are excluded from the assembly of the LORD: first, the Ammonite, the Moabite, and the illegitimate child (\textit{mamzer}) are excluded within Deut 23:3-4 [Eng. 2-3].\textsuperscript{68} Second, the exclusion from the sanctuary of the “son of a foreigner” (נָכר בן־) is found within Ezek 44:9.\textsuperscript{69} To this list in 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 4, the \textit{gēr} has been added as a new figure and does not draw from the two identified sources.\textsuperscript{70}

The purpose for which the \textit{gēr} has been added to the list of the Ammonite, the Moabite, the illegitimate child, and the foreigner may be discerned by finding the point of similarity between the listed entities. Terence Donaldson suggests that the main concern of the list is not to do with “membership in Israel,”\textsuperscript{71} meaning that the \textit{gēr} is not necessarily being treated as a non-Israelite. Instead, he argues that the list’s concern is to do with purity,\textsuperscript{72} especially if the eschatological Temple will be derived from a physical “sanctuary of men,” meaning that a notion of Temple purity expands to the spatial realm of members of the

\textsuperscript{67}Wise notes 4Q174’s change in terminology from the “assembly” (קהל) of Deut 23:2, to the “eschatological sanctuary,” lit. “house,” (בית). The present study describes this house/sanctuary as a Temple, due to line 3’s reconstructed reference to a \textit{מקדש אדני} (sanctuary/Temple of the Lord), which is rewritten from Exod 15:17-18. Michael Owen Wise, \textit{A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll}, 169.

\textsuperscript{68}On the use of Deut 23:3-4 in 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-4, see for example the following: Joseph M. Baumgarten, \textit{Studies}, 76; Michael Owen Wise, \textit{A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll}, 169; Berthelot, “La Notion de,” 205-6. Gerald Blidstein suggests that the excluded \textit{מזר} is in fact borrowed from Zech 9:6, based on various rabbinic sources which consider that passage to represent a “ban upon the future entry into Jerusalem by bastards.” This ban would include entry into the Temple, as well. Blidstein is the lone voice, however, suggesting Zech 9:6 as the motivator for an exclusion of the \textit{מזר} from the eschatological Temple of 4Q174; this passage does not seem to be the underlying motivating force. The general consensus seems appropriate, namely that Deut 23:3-4 serves as the majority scriptural predecessor for those 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 4 entries of Ammonite, Moabite, and illegitimate child. Gerald Blidstein, “4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte,” \textit{RevQ} 8, no. 31 (March 1974): 431–3.

\textsuperscript{69}On the use of Ezek 44:9 in 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-4, Allegro draws attention to line 3’s reference to \textit{לא יבוא} (“he shall not come to my Temple”) in Ezek 44:9. Allegro, \textit{Qumran Cave 4: I}, 55, line 3.

\textsuperscript{70}Donaldson, \textit{Judaism and the Gentiles}, 212. Despite Blidstein’s lone observations concerning the matter of the illegitimate child (see n. 68 above of the present chapter), his views agree with Donaldson and others that generally, the term \textit{gēr} is added to the list of those excluded from the Temple in 4Q174 in a unique fashion with neither textual predecessor nor antecedent. Blidstein, “4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources,” 433–35.


\textsuperscript{72}Donaldson, \textit{Judaism and the Gentiles}, 214.
Qumran movement in their contemporary era. For example, Donaldson observes that the individual born of an “illicit sexual union” (the illegitimate child, or mamzer) is included in the list of excluded individuals, even though this individual would be presumably “Israelite.”

What kind of impurity would preclude the gēr from entering an eschatological Temple, in this rewritten context? Christine Hayes argues that according to the Qumran movement, the gēr is arguably not ritually impure, as one might expect if the gēr were a Gentile who did not follow purity regulations. Instead, where 4Q174 is concerned, the seed of the gēr remains profane and can never be transformed into that of a Judean, and more specifically, a Qumranite. Therefore, the impurity in question is not ritual impurity, but is rather an attempt to avoid “moral impurity following from an illegal union,” or, in other words, “genealogical impurity.” The rationale for the impurity stems from Ezra 9:1-2’s exegesis of Exod 19:6 to mean that all Israelites are holy priests, with a holy seed. In other words, the authors of 4Q174 (who have been affiliated with the S tradition) do not believe that Judean kinship is mutable for Gentiles, because they lack a holy seed. To return to Donaldson, while he is correct to say that the list has to do with purity, this purity concerning the gēr specifically, at least, does in fact relate to the question of shared kinship in Israel.

In sum, the gēr in 4Q174 is excluded from the movement’s contemporary physical space in addition to the eschatological Temple into which its members will be transformed,

---

73 See Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 212–14; the present study’s section on 4Q174 in Ch. 2 (especially the citations from Brooke), and the introductory chapter’s section on the sectarian nature of the Qumran movement (especially the citations from Harrington and Schmidt), sections 2.3.3.2 and 1.1.1, respectively.
74 Donaldson, Judaism and the Gentiles, 213.
75 Christine Hayes, Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), Ch. 3, esp. pp. 61-62. The present study does not apply Haye’s notion of genealogical impurity to all occasions where the gēr is employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS. It will be seen that only the gēr of 4Q169 and 4Q174 is affected by this notion, which pertains to the S tradition of the Qumran movement.
for reasons of genealogical impurity. The implication behind the notion of genealogical impurity is that the gēr is not recognized to have made any change in kinship away from that of being a Gentile. In terms of semantics, the gēr may now represent one of two different entities. On the one hand, the gēr may be a non-Israelite “resident alien.” On the other hand, the gēr may represent a “proselyte” to general Judaism, but is excluded from the eschatological Temple because the members of the Qumran movement behind 4Q174 consider the proselyte to be perpetually genealogically impure despite this conversion.77 Either way, the gēr is clearly excluded from the eschatological Temple. Based on the evidence the present study has accumulated thus far, the gēr has typically come to represent a proselyte, when seen within scriptural rewriting in the DSS. This evidence suggests that indeed, the gēr of 4Q174 may also be understood as a “proselyte,” meaning a Gentile convert to general Judaism. While many other cases of the gēr within the present chapter demonstrate a conversion which includes shared kinship as an Israelite brother, the gēr’s exclusion from the eschatological Temple, however, implies that for the authors of 4Q174, a notion of mutable kinship for Gentiles is invalid.

77As outlined in the present study’s Introduction, Berthelot argues that within 4Q174, the gēr is a contemporary stranger claiming to be a “Jew” (i.e. a proselyte), but 4Q174 doubts the authenticity of such an action and therefore excludes him from the future Temple. Berthelot considers this theory a possibility in light of the era’s forced circumcisions. The present study suggests the sociohistorical milieu of 4Q174 is simply that the authors behind it find themselves in an era whereby Hellenistic influence has instigated the mutability of ethnic identity features within Judaism, as within the wider ancient Mediterranean, and conversions are becoming evidenced. 4Q174 denies the legitimacy of a Gentile conversion because mutable kinship is deemed impossible for the reason stated above of genealogical impurity. Berthelot, “La Notion de גֶר,” 211–13. See the present study’s Introduction chapter, section 1.2.1.3.
3.4 Texts Correlated with the Qumran Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serek (S) Tradition Indeterminate

3.4.1 4Q307, *4QText Mentioning Temple*, Frag. 1

Because *4QText Mentioning Temple* 4Q307 is a very fragmentary text, seeking connections between the fragments and textual predecessors from majority scripture within the work as a whole will prove helpful. Select textual or thematic findings can help to uncover the text’s meaning of the *gēr*. Timothy Lim does not suggest any majority scriptural predecessors in his DJD entry on this passage. In addition, Lim opens his reconstruction of 4Q307 with the caveat that the nine fragments may not all belong to one manuscript. Presumably only the damaged nature of the fragments incites such caution, because Lim observes that the fragments are “all written in the same script and on the same skin.”

78 Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” 255.
exilic community that will be welcomed to an eschatological Temple. The gēr of 4Q307 will be understood within the context of a reworking of Ezra 1:4.

Fragment 1 contains the excerpt where the term gēr has been employed. Line 6, now established to read “and it shall be that any gēr who remains” (יִהְיֶה כָּל הָגֶר הַנֵּשָׁא), is quite unique as a whole, although one verbal connection exists to other majority scripture. Numerous occurrences exist for “the one who remains” (הָנָשָׁא). A few instances deal with either Judeans who remained in the land during the exile (2 Kings 25:22) or Judeans who were exiled and are now returned or returning, namely Ezra 1:4 and Haggai 2:3. In the context of 4Q307 as a scroll connected to the Qumran movement, “exile” could represent either the historical and scripturally narrated Babylonian exile, or the Qumran movement’s own experience of “exile” from the rest of Judea and the Temple. The use of the root גָּר (“to sojourn”) in Ezra 1:4, which combines “the one who remains” (בָּשָׁא) with “from all of the places where he may be sojourning” (using רְזַ as a qal active participle, m. s.), seems to elicit the use in 4Q307 of הנשא with the same גָּר root. In 4Q307, meanwhile, the root is used as the m. s. noun gēr. It is unlikely the 4Q307 text is reading הנשא with the definite article, as a qal active participle. That verbal form with the addition of the definite article is usually found alongside an additional nominal gēr, (see, for e.g., Exod 12:49; Lev 16:29; 17:10; 17:13; 19:34), which is not the case in 4Q307. The term gēr may represent either a resident alien or a Gentile convert to Judaism, when found in its nominal form. Accordingly, Fragment 1’s combined use of הנשא and also גָּר appear to connect to Ezra 1:4, although Frag. 1, 6 transforms the outcome. In this case, the “gēr who remains” of 4Q307 appears to substitute for the Israelite in Ezra 1:4 who “remained” (i.e., who remained to return) from his place of “sojourning” during exile. The verbal and nominal intentions of the roots_residual and גָּר are purposefully exchanged to enable this shift in meaning.

Of note, Frag. 1, 7 also contains a fragmentary reference to “Israel among the nations.” To what does “Israel” refer in this line? “Israel” in TS XL, 6 is clearly a reference
to Israel as a land and geographic region. In 4Q307 Frag. 1, 7, the reference to Israel could represent the land of Israel (similar to TS XL, 6) among other Gentile regions. Or, the reference to Israel could represent “the discredited “Israel” of the past.”\(^{79}\) Or, as a third possibility, the reference to Israel could signify the members of the Qumran movement specifically (a “new” Israel),\(^{80}\) present among either Gentile individuals or nations. The setting of Ezra 1:4 describes Israelites, living in exile among Gentiles, being called back to Jerusalem. The reference to “Israel among nations” within 4Q307 appears to draw from the memory of Ezra 1:4, even though it is difficult to discern whether “Israel” is “old” or “new.” Frag. 1, 7 further supports the argument that Frag. 1, 6 reworks Ezra 1:4.

Fragment 2 provides the contemporary name for the work as a whole: line 2 contains the reference to the term מקדש, which can mean “temple.” The phrase במקדש (“in the Temple”) is mentioned twice in majority scripture, and only one of the occurrences is from a text in which the term would mean “temple” instead of a premonarchic sense of “sanctuary.” The phrase במקדש occurs in Jos 24:26, in which Joshua records covenant statutes and ordinances between the people and God and places the words at Shechem “under the oak in the sanctuary of the LORD.” The second occasion of במקדש, this time meaning “temple,” occurs in Lam 2:20. This is an exilic passage which refers to presumably a Jerusalem Temple setting with the following words: “Should priest and prophet be killed in the Temple of the LORD?”

Fragment 4 contains a legible reference to “and a brother” (אח) in line 1, a blend of vav conjunctive and noun that occurs only twice in majority scriptures: Prov 17:17 (“and a

\(^{79}\)Philip R. Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference,” in *Defining Identities: Who is the Other? We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Congress Proceedings of IOQS, July 25–28 2004, Groningen* [ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popovic; STDJ 70; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008], 33. Davies assigns three somewhat different meanings to Israel: 1) “the sect”; 2) “the discredited entity of the past, a nation punished by exile”; and 3) “a continuing, equally discredited entity, the contemporary Jewish society outside the sect.” In this fashion, Davies does not focus on Israel as a geographic entity. Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel,” 33.

\(^{80}\)Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel,” see esp. 33, 40.
brother is born for sharing adversity”) and Ecc 4:8 (“the case of solitary individuals, without a son or a brother”). The positive sentiment of Prov 17:17 seems a more likely predecessor, if the reference to a brother in 4Q307 signifies a manner in which to address fellow members of the movement. Members could be referring to one another as “brothers” as is seen in CD XIV, 5.

Frag. 5, 1 contains the word שמחה, “joy.” The noun occurs numerous times within the context of majority scripture. Notwithstanding a large pool of possible textual predecessors, Fragment 1 indicated a theme of return from exile, narrowing the possibilities. The “joy” identified in Frag. 5, 1 could come with the promise of return to the land, just as is evidenced throughout Third Isaiah (Isa 51:3; 51:11 (x2); 55:12; 61:7; 66:5).

Frag. 7, 2 contains what appears to be a reference to “appointed time[s]” מועד, also found in the same m. pl. form in Dan 12:7: “for an appointed time, appointed times מועדים, and a half.” The passage in Daniel refers to an eschatological time or time of resurrection. Another possibility in interpretation is that the pointing for the vav is a shureq instead of a full holem, and thus the result is the hophal m. pl. participle “to appoint” מועד found in Jer 24:1: “The LORD showed me two baskets of figs set מועד before the Temple כל היי of the LORD.” This Jeremiah passage locates itself within an exilic narrative, based on the second half of Jer 24:1: “This was after King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon had taken into exile from Jerusalem King Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim of Judah, together with the officials of Judah, the artisans, and the smiths, and had brought them to Babylon.” The chapter finds YHWH assuring the people that those exiles from Judah who have gone to Babylon will be returned to the land, while King Zedekiah, his officials, and those Jerusalemites who remain in Jerusalem during the exile, will be destroyed from the land.

In sum, what can one make of 4Q307 and its employment of the gēr? The results of textual bricolage are an allusion to an exilic community of remaining gērim, with a likeness
to Ezra 1:4. This exilic community may refer to fellow members using the term “brother,” with a possible allusion to Prov 17:17. Based on the combined allusions to a Temple (Lam 2:20), joy, and a possible future appointed time (Dan 12:7; Jer 24:1), it appears that a return to the land, complete with a future Temple for exiled gērîm, are being ushered in. Intriguingly, that the gēr substitutes for the returning Judean suggests that the gēr should be a “Judean” also, and not a “resident alien.” Furthermore, that members may identify as brothers suggests the gēr of 4Q307, with a meaning of returning Judean, may in fact represent a “brother” in the Qumran movement.
3.4.2 4Q498 *Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments*, Frag. 7

1 ]h to the gēr [
2 ]v.[

Other fragments of interest are as follows:

Frag. 2

Frag. 3, Col. II

Frag. 3, Col. I

Frag. 4

Frag. 6

Frag. 8

lower margin?

Frag. 15

The overall fragmentary nature of *Hym/Sap 4Q498* calls for a broader study of the fragments to understand better the overarching character of the text and the subsequent nature of the gēr within it. Maurice Baillet added a question mark to his title for these fifteen papyri fragments, “Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments,” highlighting his uncertainty surrounding these fragments. This uncertainty extends to whether the fragments stem from one single

---

81Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 73.
manuscript or not.\textsuperscript{82} However, the various papyri fragments all appear the same in colour, and the handwriting itself looks fairly uniform in style, apart from the handwriting of Fragment 9 which is smaller than that of the other fragments (a fragment not under consideration in the present study).\textsuperscript{83} Furthermore, a link to Deuteronomy Chapters 8 and 26 as majority scriptural predecessors can be observed among the fragments, strengthening the likelihood these fragments are indeed from one document of scriptural rewriting. The occasion where the term \textit{gēr} has been employed within Fragment 7, more specifically the reference to a \textit{ר-wife} with the \textit{plene} spelling, falls within the framework of Deuteronomy 26. Numerous other texts are also reused, in a similar fashion and with a similar ideological outcome as 4Q377. 4Q498, like 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, reworks scriptural predecessors in which references are made to a land of honey that will be promised to the people of the text.

A recognizable reuse of text is first found in Fragment 2,\textsuperscript{84} whereby line 2 contains the phrase \textit{ים מִרְיָנָה} (“and streams of waters”): the phrase rewrites Deut 8:7. The Deuteronomic verse falls within Moses’ entreatment of the Israelites to follow the commandments of the “LORD your God” when they cross over the Jordan, precisely because “the LORD your God is bringing you into a good land, a land with \textit{streams of waters} (רֶץ וָמֵלָל).” This verse and verses 8 through 10 go on to say that the land with flowing streams is also a land

with springs and underground waters welling in valleys and hills, 8 a land of wheat and barley, of vines and fig trees and pomegranates, a land of olive trees and honey, a land where you may eat bread without scarcity, where you will lack nothing, a land whose stones are iron and from whose hills you may mine copper. You shall eat your fill and bless the LORD your God for the good land that he has given you.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{82}Baillet, \textit{Qumran Grotte 4: III}, 73.
\textsuperscript{83}Thank-you to Dr. Sarianna Metso for making this observation while studying the plate.
\textsuperscript{84}Fragment 1, I, 1 contains the legible phrase \textit{כנפשי בְּבַר (“the favoured one of myself”)), however, this phrase does not occur in any majority scripture. Fragments 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 all either contain unrecognizable portions of words, or words that are too vague to pinpoint to one passage, such as \textit{לי (“to me”) in Fragment 10 or \textit{עבר (“one passing over”) in Fragment 13.}\end{flushright}
4Q498 is alluding to the land of plenty in Deuteronomy 8, which shall be set aside for the Israelites.

If one adds in the supralinear tav, Frag. 3, 1, 3 reads as חָשֵׁשׁ, which is a piel active participle in the f. s.: “one who reckons.” The verb is conjugated in this same piel singular participle (albeit m. s., and not f. s.) only in Prov 24:8 “One who reckons (הַמָּכְשֵׁשׁ) to do evil will be called a mischief-maker.” Even though Baillet does not identify the possible connection to majority scripture, perhaps Proverb 24 is one of the passages he has in mind when suggesting that the fragments of 4Q498 are “sapiential.” The proverb does not refer to a land specifically. However, Prov 24:13 refers to honey (“My child, eat honey, for it is good, and the drippings of the honeycomb are sweet to your taste”), calling to mind the allusion to honey from Fragment 2. A connection may be made between this wisdom passage of Proverb 24, and Deuteronomy 8’s connection to a land of honey promised on the condition of following the law.

Frag. 4, 1 contains the partial word יֵלְצֵל. Assuming this may be a Hiphil form of חָלָץ (“to rescue, save, deliver”), two majority scripture occasions exist of חָלָץ, which is the Hiphil imperfect 3 m. s. form. They occur in Isa 36:20 and this passage’s repetition in 2 Kings 18:35: “Who among all the gods of these countries have saved their countries out of my hand, that the LORD should have saved Jerusalem (כִּי־יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵיהֶם יִצְלֵה from my hand?)” In Isa 36:17, Israel is described as a land of “corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards.” The 2 Kings passage draws on Isaiah’s description of “a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards,” and then adds to this “a land of olive trees and of honey,” which is the reference to the land from Deut 8:8. Thus it seems more likely that Frag. 4, 1 is reusing the 2 Kings 18:35 passage, with the shared connection to a land of honey in Deuteronomy 8 and the land of Israel in Isaiah 36.

Fragments 6 through 8 can be considered together as a unit, all possibly with an origin in Deuteronomy 26 and a thematic relationship to a land of honey rewarded for obedience to
the tithing commandments. With regard to the first part of the unit, "with all your heart," Frag. 6, 1, Baillet lists numerous parallel forms. Of the suggested options, Deuteronomy 26 is the most likely reinterpreted text for Frag. 6, 1, as it will be noted shortly that not only Frag. 6, 2, but also Fragments 7 and 8 seem likewise to be derived from Deuteronomy 26. Deut 26:16 in full reads as follows: “This day the LORD your God is commanding you to do these statutes and judgements; you will obey and you will do them with all your heart (בָּכָל־לבָּבו) and with all your soul.” As was the case with Deuteronomy 8, Deuteronomy 26 is also related to land, and deals with the regulations concerning first fruits and tithes. Frag. 6, 2 has a possible reading רָבָּר followed by the letter lamed after some missing text. In Deut 26:18 one finds שֹמרְלַוֶרָרָוֶר (with the 2 m. s. pausal suffix form), as in “he has spoken to you to keep all his commandments.” The dibber in piel perfect 3 m. s. followed by the lamed seems a likely match for Frag. 6, 2, confirming the connection to Deuteronomy 26.

Frag. 7, 1, the second part of this unit, contains the reference to a לֵגיֵר, which Baillet suggests to be a plene spelling for לֵגיֵר. This fragment could fit within the context of Deut 26:12 and its reference “to the Levite, to the gēr, to the orphan, and to the widow” (לֵגיֵר לֵגיֵר ווָי לַוָא), who are the recipients of the third year produce tithe. Or, the fragment could draw from the reference to these same tithe recipients listed in Deut 26:13, although this version of the tithe recipients inserts a vav conjunction before the lamed prefix attached to the gēr. Chapter 2 discussed the two options of the letters he or khet visible at the end of the missing word that precedes the לֵגיֵר, instead of the expected yod from לֵגי, as in Deut 26:12, or vav, as in Deut 26:13. Because no identical match can be made to majority scripture, no definitive conclusions can be drawn regarding the exact surrounding environment of the לֵגיֵר, despite the strong allusions to the gēr as a tithe produce recipient.

85 Deut 4:29; 6:5; 10:12; 26:16; 30:2, 6 and 10; and Prov 3:5. Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 74.
86 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 74. Baillet cites the plene spelling of לֵגיֵר from Deut 5:14 in 8Q3, along with לֵגיֵר from a Samaritan manuscript of Deut 10:19 as predecessors.
87 See Ch. 2 of the present study, section 2.3.4.2.
Fragment 8, which is the third part of the unit, offers the fragmentary letters יזפ. Baillet does not offer any suggested majority scriptural predecessors for this line. The letters may represent a shortened form of the reference in Deut 26:13 to תָךְ וַצְּמִּלֶּכֶל: “I have given it [the holy portion] to the Levite, and to the gēr, to the orphan and to the widow, in accordance with all your commandment that you commanded me.” The purpose of following this commandment, made clear in Deut 26:15, is for the sake of receiving YHWH’s blessing on the people and on the land. The blessing makes the land into “a land flowing with milk and honey.” The reference calls to mind allusions to various “lands of honey” from Fragments 2, 3 and 4, described in Deuteronomy 8 and Proverb 24.

Finally, Fragment 15, the last fragment of 4Q498, contains an apparent sentence ending with זא, as in the object pronoun “him,” which happens to be the ending of Deut. 8:6: “And you shall keep the commandments of the LORD your God, to walk in his ways and to fear him (הָאָרַא).” The passage has returned full circle back to Deuteronomy 8, which was the reinterpreted subject of Fragment 2.

Where 4Q498 is concerned, textual allusions are borrowed in particular from Deuteronomy 8 and 26. A connection to 2 Kings 18:35 also exists, as that passage draws from Deut 8:8. The two Deuteronomy chapters deal with the promise of a bountiful land to be received on the condition of following the commandments. Imbued also within the text are sapiential undertones that relate to the theme of a land of honey, via a connection to Proverb 24. The overall effect hints of a specific commandment, meant for a specific people. This people is not the same as those Israelites who stood on the edge of the Jordan, waiting to cross over. Rather, a new audience is under consideration. The gēr passage appears to locate itself within the confines of Deuteronomy 26. As with 4QFlor 4Q174, the gēr of 4Q498 could be interpreted in two ways: either the gēr has been used in a preexilic fashion with

88The present study has considered that he might be a Qumran plene spelling for לי, but there is no extant form in the DSS corpus that uses such a spelling for לי.
respect to the Deuteronomy insertion, as a “resident alien” who receives the third year tithe, or, the rewritten milieu of a new land for a new people within 4Q498 may efface prior notions of a “resident alien.” The second argument would imply that the gēr could represent a proselyte in 4Q498. Due to the shared thematic promise of a land of honey between 4Q498 and 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, an additional text which clearly shows the gēr as a brother and one who is included in the promise of receiving a new land, the possibility of shared kinship through ethnic conversion for the gēr within 4Q498 is also feasible.

3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back, Frag. 45

Many of 4Q520’s forty-five fragments are indeed, quite fragmentary, therefore the present study will only analyze a brief selection of phrases that may derive from majority scripture which reveals relevant themes concerning the gēr. This fragmentary document responds well to the method of bricolage, revealing the theme of a postexilic promise in which abandoned gērîm may be called back to YHWH in the same fashion as Israel.

Frag. 1, 4 contains the one word שֵׁלֵלְימִי, which is the masculine plural in construct form of שֵׁלֵלְיָם (“eternities”). This noun in the m. pl. construct occurs only in Isa 45:17, within Second Isaiah’s (Isa 40-55) exilic message: “But Israel is saved by the LORD with everlasting salvation; you shall not be put to shame or confounded to all eternity, lit. as far as eternities of forever” (עד עולם עד עולם).
Fragment 18 also contains what appears to be a masculine plural construct form of יָאָוֵלָה ("eternities of"). Baillet’s inclusion of the bracket after the yod implies there to be missing text following the bracket. The manner in which the fragment perforates leaves it unclear whether a letter should follow the yod or not. However, a final form mem would likely not fit into the space remaining to the left of the yod, leaving יָאָוֵל in construct form, as in Frag. 1, 4, a more likely possibility. Due to the similar construct form, Fragments 1 and 18 appear to belong together, linking both to the exile message in Isa 45:17 of a promise of salvation to Israel.

The final fragment to consider is Fragment 45, in which one finds the occasion where the term gēr has been employed, הנורם. In line 2, one notes the unique structure וָאֵרָן, of which only the word itself ("a brand") and not the preceding word ending in final form nun is found in Zech 3:2: “Is not this (man) a brand (יָאָוֵל)` plucked from the fire?” Line 3 contains the fragmentary phrase וָאֵרָן עֶזֶב. There is no occasion of majority scripture whereby הנורם is followed by an ayin, zayin, and vav. Presumably the letters form a m. pl. passive participle "the ones who were abandoned"). The plural gērîm and the plural passive participle “the ones who were abandoned” do not appear to be functioning like an attributive adjective (“the abandoned gērîm”), because normally the definiteness would be attached to both parts of the phrase in such a construct.89 Instead, the phrase appears to function as a predicate adjective, thus, “the gērîm have been abandoned.” While no m. pl. or f. pl. forms of עֶזֶב or עֶזֶבָה exist in majority scripture, a number of occurrences of עֶזֶב (the f. s.) occur in prophetic texts that deal with the prophecy of exile, exilic, or postexilic themes: Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4. In each of these examples, Israel is the subject of the

89 Choon-Leong Seow, A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew (rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 72. Seow writes the following: “The attributive adjective modifies a noun. In this usage, the adjective agrees with the noun in gender, number, and definiteness. It also comes after the noun.” Furthermore, a participle “may also be used like an attributive adjective.” Seow, A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew, 83. Hebrew of the DSS does not seem to function any differently in this regard. Elisha Qimron discusses the feature, prevalent in DSS Hebrew, of doubly-marking both nouns with the plural in an attributive construct phrase, but says nothing with regard to the features of definiteness in noun or adjective phrases. Elisha Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 74–75.
abandonment, whether alluded to symbolically as the wife of YHWH, identified simply as a “city,” or named metonymously as a city within Israel, such as Jerusalem. In the postexilic examples in particular, though, the message is clearly one of hope that YHWH will bring Israel out of her desolate nature once more. In Frag. 45, 3, Israel is substituted with the gērim who have been abandoned.

What conclusions can be drawn concerning the nature of 4Q520? Fragments 1, 18 and 45 all make use of various exilic prophetic imagery, from Isa 45:17 and Zech 3:2, and also allude to other exilic and postexilic imagery from Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4. Perhaps the abandoned gērim of 4Q520 will be called back and reconstituted in a similar fashion to those identified symbols or metonyms for Israel which were also the subject of abandonment. These gērim, in substituting for Israel, appear to contain some type of Judean kinship.

3.5 Chapter Conclusions
This chapter considered the meaning of the gēr employed in the DSS that make use of scriptural rewriting. Similarities were observed by means of parallels in thematic, verbal, or nominal structures between the selected DSS and majority scriptures that possibly serve as predecessors. The process of bricolage, that is, pulling together pieces into a new whole, was utilized in the fragmentary cases of 4Q307; 4Q377; 4Q498; and 4Q520 to seek overarching themes that could reveal the nature of the text, and the nature of the gēr within the text. Overall, the reuse of a breadth of material was evident, which helped to uncover the meaning of the gēr.

Findings from Chapter 3 reveal that the gēr is always more than a Gentile “resident alien,” and in fact is always a Judean convert. In some cases, the gēr is equated with an Israelite “brother.” In other cases, the gēr clearly represents an individual of Judean ethnic identity because of other indicators in the text, such as the gēr receiving an inheritance of
land, or even substituting in the text for “Israel” or a “Judean.” Because these features of shared kinship and connection to land are important to the Judean identity of a gēr when the term is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, consequently the features of shared kinship and connection to land appear strong within the ethnic identity of members of the Qumran movement, in general. These features have been observed to be important, regardless of the present or future (eschatological) implications of any of the texts. Hellenistic influence of mutable ethnicity, already apparent within other literature of late Second Temple Judaism, is clearly evident.

In addition, 4QInstr 4Q423, which has been identified as a document that precedes the D and S traditions, expresses the gēr as a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from those who will receive the mystery of existence. In this example, the gēr takes on the meaning of a Gentile convert to Judaism, but he is somehow not quite “converted” enough to receive this mystery. This example lends crediblility to all the examples that follow, whereby the gēr is always identified as a Judean, but is variably included or not.

To that end, when the findings from Chapter 2 regarding the textual correlations with either the D or S traditions are considered in tandem with the results from Chapter 3, the results yield the following interesting preliminary divisions:

The gēr within CD VI-VII; CD XIV; TS 11QT a XL; Apoc. Pent. B 4Q377; 4QOrd a 4Q159; and 4QFour Lots 4Q279, always appears to be a full Judean (Israeli) member within the movement. As it happens, each of these texts is correlated with the D tradition. Therefore it appears that the D tradition accepts Gentile converts to Judaism as members, and considers Judean ethnicity to be mutable and open to Gentiles. Within 4QpNah 4Q169 and 4QFlor 4Q174, the gēr appears to represent a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from the ingroup movement, because his conversion status is esteemed “fraudulent.” These two texts correlate with the S tradition. In the S tradition, therefore, it appears that Judean
ethnicity is immutable and closed to Gentiles. Finally, the gēr in 4QText Mentioning Temple 4Q307; 4QHymnic or Sapiential Fragments 4Q498; and 4QTexts Inscribed Only on the Back 4Q520, once more appears to be Judean, both because he “substitutes” for prior textual allusions to Judeans or Israel, and also because this gēr is included in the ingroup’s promise of land. These three texts have been correlated with the Qumran movement overall, although their exact connection with either the traditions of D or S is indeterminate. Despite the undecided nature of their connection to the traditions of D or S specifically, these passages still add value to the overall argument that the gēr represents a Gentile convert to Judaism within the DSS (whether or not the gēr’s convert status is deemed legitimate or not). Overall, the D tradition appears more permeable than the S tradition, in that Judean ethnicity is mutable to Gentiles in the D tradition, but immutable to Gentiles in the S tradition. Why would the tradition of S uphold genealogical impurity which considers Judean kinship immutable to Gentiles, and consequently Gentile conversions to be “fraudulent”? Could other textual findings within the DSS add clarity to understanding these differences between the traditions of D and S?

The above observations and questions will be further assessed in Chapter 4. There, the findings from Chapters 2 and 3 will be considered in closer detail. Upon examination of the identity-marking features of a shared notion of kinship, a connection to a land, and a shared common culture in the practice of circumcision, the specific nature of the D and S traditions will stand out in clearer detail.
Chapter 4
Locating the Gēr and Assessing Ethnic Identity at Qumran:
Shared Kinship; Connection to Land; and Common Culture in Circumcision

Chapter 2 provided the important preliminary step of correlating the DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting whereby the gēr is employed with either the D or S traditions. Chapter 2 was instructional in that it brought to the fore the fact that the gēr is always included within the texts correlating with the tradition of D (CD; TS; 4Q377; 4Q159; and 4Q279), and is always excluded within the texts correlating firmly with the tradition of S (4Q169; and 4Q174). Chapter 3 proceeded to assess how the gēr changed between its employment in scrolls utilizing scriptural rewriting, and identifiable majority scriptural predecessors, in order to uncover changes in meaning that may have taken place due to differing sociohistorical environments. Chapter 3 discovered that the gēr is always more than a Gentile “resident alien,” and is in fact a Gentile convert to Judaism. Even in texts that correlate with the Qumran movement overall but a definitive alignment with the traditions of D or S is indeterminate, the gēr is still clearly this Judean convert.

Furthermore, the individual assessment of texts in Chapter 3 highlighted the fact that the features of shared kinship and connection to a land—both identified to be significant markers of late Second Temple Judean ethnic identity—are also significant for the Qumran movement. In addition to kinship and land, the Introduction chapter found that the ethnic feature of common culture (sometimes described under the purview of “religious practice”), in particular the practice of circumcision as a sign of the Abrahamic covenant with YHWH, was also a significant feature that marked ethnic conversions within late Second Temple Judaism. Having now recognized the importance of shared kinship and connection to a land for Qumran ethnic identity, along with the mutability, or immutability, of these features...
which permits or denies Gentile conversions, it would make sense for the feature of common 
culture in the practice of circumcision to play a role in these conversions, as is the case in late 
Second Temple Judaism more generally.

Therefore, the chapter proceeds with an analysis of the three features: first, the shared 
notion of kinship, and in particular the *gēr*’s identification as a “brother”; second, the *gēr*’s 
inclusion in the promise of land; and third, the manner in which passages correlating with the 
traditions of D or S discuss the matter of circumcision, regarded to be a known sign of 
conversion to membership in a Judean group. The chapter locates the term *gēr* with respect 
to how the term interacts with notions of kinship and land. The chapter furthermore collates 
the findings of Chapters 2 and 3 regarding both the convert status of the *gēr* within scriptural 
rewriting in the DSS and also the correlations with either the D or S traditions of those 
passages. The manner in which the features appear, when analyzed through the lens of their 
correlations with the D or S traditions, will further reveal how and why levels of ethnic 
mutability differ between the D and S traditions. This chapter discovers that within the S 
tradition, members of S are in fact “supra-Judeans” who undergo an extra “circumcision of 
the heart.” This “supra-Judean” nature of members helps to explain why the S tradition does 
not accept regular Gentile converts to Judaism as does the D tradition. Finally, while it was 
noted in the Introduction that Shaye Cohen argues that the component of shared kinship is 
immutable within early Judean conversions, Steve Mason and Philip Esler consider the 
notion of shared kinship to represent only one feature of the broader picture of a mutable 
notion of ethnicity. For these two scholars, the identity *in toto* is mutable, which includes all 
three features observed to hold particular significance within the present study. Such a 
suggestion implies that all three features have the potential to demonstrate mutability, and 
this possibility is exactly the finding of the present chapter.
4.1 Shared Kinship as a Marker of Qumran Ethnic Identity: How Gēr Represents Kin

This section will collate the particular patterns whereby the comparison between the gēr of scriptural rewriting and majority scriptural predecessors highlighted the significance of the feature of shared kinship for Qumran ethnic identity, and how its mutability or immutability affected the meaning of the gēr as a convert. In some cases, certain passages evidence multiple patterns in which the gēr has come to represent general Judean kin. The cases where the gēr is nevertheless excluded, despite demonstrating Judean kinship, will be considered together as one group. Finally, because the gēr is often found to equate to a “brother,” the section also explores further the identity of a “brother” within the Qumran movement.

4.1.1 Shared Kinship: Gēr Is (an Israelite) Brother

A dominant theme, found in a number of passages, identifies the gēr as kin by means of the manipulation of “brotherhood” language. The passages that employ the gēr from CD VI, 14-VII, 1; CD XIV, 3-6; 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1-3; 4Q307; and 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 1-9, all fit within this largest pattern. In CD VI, 14-VII, 1, the memory of an Israelite loving his friend like himself (Lev 19:18) conflates with the memory of an Israelite who shall love the gēr like himself (Lev 19:34). The reinterpretation of this HL material results in the conclusion that CD VI, 20-21’s reference to both loving a brother and also helping a gēr suggests that this gēr substitutes for a friend, and is indeed a further explication of a brother, albeit a brother in need.

CD XIV, 3-6 states that each category listed, including the gēr, is a “brother” one to the other. If the “brother” represents Israelite kin, then the gēr is also Israelite kin in CD XIV. In addition, while this gēr of CD XIV is clearly a member of the camps, calling to mind Deut 29:9-11, CD goes a step further and identifies in CD XIII, 20 that the assembly of the camps is for the “seed of Israel.” Thus, the gēr is identified as Israelite “seed,” which, when placed alongside the reference to those listed members as “brothers,” identifies the gēr
as Israelite kin in an indirect fashion as well. The cumulative effect of “seed” and “brother” is one of a shared notion of kinship.

4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1-3 consists of further reinterpretation of HL material, namely the manumission regulations of Leviticus 25:47-55. In particular, 4Q159 omits brother references that are present in Lev 25:47-48, and adds a stipulation that differentiates a gēr from a Gentile. This rewriting leaves no way to differentiate between a gēr and the textual memory of a “brother” as in Leviticus 25, suggesting that the gēr is an Israelite brother. These findings are confirmed by the deletion of “tōshab” resulting in the use of “gēr” without accompaniment, the term known in rabbinic texts to represent a Judean proselyte.

Where 4Q307 is concerned, Frag. 4, 1 refers to “and a brother,” possibly borrowed from Prov 17:17. The term could be a nomenclature for fellow movement members.

Finally, the joint allusion of 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 1 to Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16 conflates the figures of a man, a friend, and a gēr, while omitting a reference to a “brother,” which in the context of Deut 1:16 is used to differentiate between an Israelite brother and a resident alien gēr. The added feature that the gēr is included in a list of those that will replace other nations, borrowed from Exod 3:8, further effaces the differentiation between an Israelite and a gēr. In 4Q377, as was seen in 4Q159 above, when the term “brother” in a scriptural predecessor differentiates between a resident alien gēr and an Israelite brother, the scriptural predecessors’s use of the term “brother” is omitted in the scriptural rewriting.

4.1.2 Shared Kinship: Gēr Is Identified as Israelite Kin through Other Kinship Terminology

4Q279 Frag. 5, 1-6 and 11QTa XL, 5-6 both categorize accordingly, whereby the gēr’s identity as Israelite kin is established through kinship terminology, apart from that of direct identification as a “brother.” The statement in 4Q279 Frag. 5, 3 that lots (sg. דָּרְשָׁה) shall be ordered according to one’s “greatness of pedigree” implies a kinship connection between the
Aaronide priests, Levites, Israelites, and the gērîm, even though the gērîm are ranked fourth in the list. The very fact that these gērîm receive a lot at all implies that they are now Israelite, in particular when one contrasts this passage to a majority scriptural predecessor such as Num 36:2, in which land inheritance is appointed by lot to Israelites, specifically. This outcome whereby a lot is now granted inverts the memory of Num 18:20 and Deut 26:11, in which the Aaronide priest, the gēr and the Levite receive other offerings or tithes precisely because they do not own land.

With respect to 11QTa, all those who enter the Temple are referred to as “the children of Israel” (XLVI, 7-8), and thus indirectly the gēr of XL, 6, who is within the third courtyard of the Temple, is also one of these Israelite children.

4.1.3 Shared Kinship: Kin by “Textual Substitution” of a Gēr for an Israelite

11QTa XL, 6; 4Q307; and 4Q520 all utilize the method of textually substituting a gēr in the place of an Israelite to highlight the gēr’s Israelite kinship. 11QTa XL, 6 describes “gērîm who were born” as having access to a third Temple courtyard. These gērîm appear to substitute for the reference to “children who were born” in the third generation of Deut 23:9, who are permitted to enter the assembly of YHWH after these three generations, and thus presumably have come to represent Israelites. The gērîm are now these Israelites.

Where 4Q307 is concerned, the reference in line 6 to a “gēr who remains” (using the nominal form of the root גָּרָה, and the root שָׁאר as a participle with a verbal sense) calls to mind Ezra 1:4’s narration that calls the remnant (also using שָׁאר as a participle, but with a nominal sense) to return to Judea after the completion of the Babylonian exile, from wherever they are sojourning (using the verbal form of the root גָּרָה). This remnant in Ezra 1:4 is obviously with reference to the Israelite people. The “gēr who remains” in 4Q307 appears to take the place of the Israelite as the one who is called back to Judea, when the verbal and nominal intentions for the roots גָּרָה שָׁאר swap between the two passages.
In the case of 4Q520, the reference in Frag. 45, 3 to “abandoned gērîm” is reminiscent of exilic and postexilic prophetic texts in which an abandoned Israel will be called back out of her desolation (Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4). The exilic theme is confirmed by repeat allusions to other relevant passages such as Isa 45:17. Thus the gērîm of 4Q520 are inserted into a new, yet familiar, context, when one envisions them as the object being called back, substituting for the Israelite.

### 4.1.4 Shared Kinship: Physical Proximity with Respect to Other Judeans Indicates Gēr as Sharing in Kinship

This fourth categorization of utilizing the strategy of scriptural rewriting so that the gēr comes to represent a Judean applies to 11QTᵃ XL, 5-6. The gērîm in 11QTᵃ XL, 6 are esteemed to share Judean kinship due to their physical proximity to other Judeans. The third courtyard described in XL, which appears to reinterpret the Temple exclusions until the “third generation” in Deut 23:8-9, includes gērîm and women together. The women in this courtyard are seemingly Judean by birth, and for purity reasons, such as the regulation to avoid closeness to Gentiles on the Sabbath (CD XI, 14), it therefore seems impossible that women would be placed next to Gentile resident aliens in this third Temple courtyard. The gērîm in this passage, based on their physical proximity to women in the third courtyard, represent Judean kin and thus proselytes.

### 4.1.5 Shared Kinship: Effacement of Gēr as a Resident Alien

This categorization whereby scriptural rewriting effaces either the term gēr that was employed or the original context of the gēr in the majority scriptural predecessor, applies to three passages, namely 11QTᵃ XLVIII, 6-7; 4Q377; and 4Q498. With regard to 11QTᵃ XLVIII, 6-7, the gēr was clearly omitted from its textual predecessor Deut 14:21. The reason established for the omission was that the author understood a contemporary meaning of “proselyte,” as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, would be equated with the term gēr, but an actual meaning of “resident alien” was necessary within the context of the Deuteronomistic
passage. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the term was simply omitted. The absence implies that the author(s) understood a contemporary meaning for the *gēr* other than that of “resident alien.”

Where 4Q377 is concerned, the replacement of the Mosaic voice of Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16 with the voice of God effaces the majority scriptural context and “resident alien” meaning of the *gēr*. Instead, the *gēr* of 4Q377 is now included in the promise of a land which is better and wider. While this new land alludes to that promise offered to the Israelites in Exod 3:8, it is in fact a land in a new rewritten context, which may now include the *gēr* as Israelite.

Within 4Q498, it is once again the majority scriptural context of a “resident alien” which is effaced. 4Q498 exhibits a conflation of Deuteronomy 8 and 26 and thus alludes to a new land of honey, which could signal a new meaning for the *gēr* in this new land, different from the one promised in Deuteronomy. The effaced resident alien context of these two Deuteronomistic passages permits the *gēr* to be a part of the new land, implying that this *gēr* is no longer a resident alien and more likely a “Judean.”

### 4.1.6 Shared Kinship: Judean Convert Status of a *Gēr* Is Denied

This final categorization represents the *gēr* in quite a different fashion. In the two relevant texts, namely 4Q169, Frags. 3-4, 7-10 and 4Q174, Frag. 1, I, 1-4, irrespective of whether the *gēr* can be identified as sharing in Judean kinship, he is nevertheless excluded from membership in the intended ingroup of each text. Where 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1-4 is concerned, within the list of Ammonite, Moabite, illegitimate child, foreigner, and *gēr*, the *gēr* is excluded from the future eschatological Temple due to genealogical impurity. This *gēr* was perceived to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism both by the *gēr* himself and also by general Judaism, but it appears that the S tradition responsible for this text denies the
legitimacy of such an act of conversion because a Gentile’s kinship can never change to that of a Judean. For that reason, the gēr is among those excluded from the eschatological Temple because according to the tradition of S, the gēr-convert is a Gentile just the same.

The gēr of 4Q169, another text correlated with the S tradition, may be regarded in exactly the same fashion as the gēr of 4Q174. In 4Q169, Frags. 3-4, II, 8-9, a gēr has “attached himself” to a list of kings, princes, priests, and people, reminiscent of that gēr belonging to Isa 14:1. Since all the figures listed represent “misled” Pharisees, this means that the gēr, being equally swayed by Pharisaic teachings, likely represents a Gentile convert to Pharisaic Judaism. Of course, on one hand, members of the list in 4Q169 are excluded precisely because they follow Pharisaic teachings, and this controversy between sectarian groups is one reason for the gēr’s exclusion. Equally important, however, is to remember that according to the S tradition, the legitimacy of a Gentile’s conversion to Judaism is denied because a Judean’s kinship is not esteemed mutable to Gentiles. In other words, the gēr-convert of 4Q169, regardless of an affiliation with any opposing sectarian group, would still be excluded because of genealogical impurity.

In these two examples, Gentile converts to Judaism may consider themselves, and be considered by general Judaism, to have fully taken on a Judean ethnic identity, including the feature of kinship; nevertheless, the legitimacy of their conversions is denied by the authors of these texts.

4.1.7 Who Is a “Brother”?
As noted in section 4.1.1 above, certain of the patterns of scriptural rewriting involve the gēr assuming a notion of shared kinship by means of equation with a Qumran movement “brother.” Thus far the present study concludes that the “brother” is clearly Israelite (Judean) in the DSS. Can a brother in the occasions where the term gēr has been employed in the DSS truly indicate a notion of shared Judean kinship? At this point a brief survey of other scholars
who have also considered the question of the nature of the “brother” in the Qumran movement is in order.

According to Aharon Shemesh, “‘your fellow [brother]’ (אחיך), ‘your kinsman [friend]’ (רעך) and ‘your countryman [child of your people]’ (בן עמך) refer exclusively to members of the sect; not only are those outside the sect not ‘fellows’ or ‘kin,’ they are not even counted as members of the same people.”¹ Shemesh looks to 1QS IX, 15-18, 21-23, which prohibits movement members to have any dealings whatsoever with the “men of the pit” so that the counsel of the Torah might remain hidden from those persons.² Thus, anyone not included in the movement becomes a man of the pit. For anyone who is not a brother, friend, or child of the people, “a concerted effort should be made to expose them to the opposite treatment.”³ This “treatment” in question, to which the opposite should be applied for those who are not brothers, friends, and children of the people, is that of loving one’s brother as oneself, from Lev 19:16-18.⁴ All other outside Judeans are considered enemies.⁵ In this case, a “brother” would be more specifically only a member of the Qumran movement, and Judean kinship itself becomes irrelevant.

According to Katell Berthelot, the reference to “one after the other [lit. each one after his brother]” (איש אחר אחיו) in CD XIV, 5 refers to the brother as a movement member: the brother reference is not cosanguinal. She concludes thus because the terms “brother” (אח) and also “friend” (רע) often occur together and seemingly as synonyms, such as their placement within CD XX, 17-18: “each will speak 18 to his friend, each (helping) his brother to be righteous” (ת אחיו ש עindsayו).⁶ Berthelot argues that the

⁶Berthelot, “La Notion de רע,” 189–90, and n. 64. Hamidović offers a perspective similar to Berthelot on the Qumran movement’s meaning of the “brother,” calling the “brother” (אח) synonymous with the “friend” (רע), and also citing CD XX, 18 as example. David Hamidović, “À la frontière de l’artérité, le statut de l’étranger-
combination represents an Israelite brother (a fellow Israelite), with respect to the command to love the “brother” like himself of CD VI, 20-21, which she links to the parallel structure of Lev 19:18, a passage that instead inserts the “friend.”

In this regard Berthelot’s description of a “brother” differs from that of Shemesh, for Berthelot emphasizes the general Israelite kinship of a movement member, while Shemesh negates the general Israelite kinship in the act of highlighting the movement’s view that any outsider, whether Judean or non, is specifically not kin. Both consider a “brother” and “friend” as synonyms. Neither conclude that the Qumran movement considers the “brother” as a literal brother in terms of cosanguinal relationship. They do, however, each allude to the fact that a notion of shared kinship (whether Israelite or “Qumran movement member”) exists in identifying one another as brothers.

In addition to brother language expressing a notion of shared kinship, another purpose for the use of brother language within the DSS can be identified. Jutta Jokiranta and Cecilia Wassen suggest that the purpose of brother language within the DSS, in particular D and S, is to identify hierarchical relationships between movement members. The “brother,” when not meaning a cosanguinal kin, such as CD V, 19 “Johne and his brother,” represents “the other” and is found to be synonymous with the “friend.” Jokiranta and Wassen take into consideration both the passages from CD VI-VII and XIV. The repeated use of “brother” in CD XIV, 5-6 describes the hierarchical ordering for both seating and inquiry, and implies “one after the other.” The use of “brother” three times in CD VI, 11-VII, 4, esteemed to be an early D tradition, emphasizes the “unity of the members and their behaviour towards each

résident (עון) dans les milieux esséniens,” in L’étranger dans la Bible et ses lectures (ed. Jean Riaud; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2007), 286. The translation “neighbour” as found in Charlesworth has been changed to match the translation of Berthelot (וע as “friend”).

Berthelot, “La Notion de עון,” 190.

Furthermore, Jokiranta and Wassen point out that while this brother language may express unity, it does not express democracy. They argue that instead of a “brotherly guild,” the Qumran movement appears as a “patriarchal household,” where members may be brothers, but these brothers have different “responsibilities and ranks.” Brother language is used to express this hierarchical relationship. The recognition that hierarchical status is normative amid Qumran movement members, in addition to the finding that gēr and brother are coterminous (in the tradition of D), confirm the ingroup status and shared kinship of the gēr within texts that describe hierarchy (namely CD XIV, 4Q279, and 11QT9 XL, the former two placing the gēr fourth in the list, and the latter placing the gēr in a third courtyard).

4.1.8 Ethnic Identity in the Feature of Shared Kinship:

Conclusions

Within the Qumran movement a brother appears to represent either a fellow member who is Israelite, or a fellow member who is “beyond” being Israelite. The brother is not cosanguinal, but shares the same kinship with other brothers within the same tradition. Furthermore, the term conveys a meaning of hierarchical rank within the movement. Because a brother and a gēr are synonymous, this finding implies that a gēr who is included is also considered either a fellow member who is Israelite, or a fellow member who is “beyond” being Israelite.

The divergent findings of Shemesh and Berthelot can be explained when one compares their findings with those of the present study, namely that within the Qumran movement a difference exists between the D and S traditions. According to Berthelot, a “brother” has an Israelite identity. The gēr as a brother, who is Israelite even if ranked hierarchically lower, matches the observations of the present study’s texts found to correlate with the D tradition in which the gēr is a brother: CD VI-VII; CD XIV; 4Q159; and 4Q377.

---

10Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 201.
11Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 203.
12Shaye Cohen also recognizes that the hierarchy expressed by placing the gēr farther down the list of members (in TS and in CD XIV) does not negate the gēr’s status as a convert. Cohen, “Crossing,” 30.
In each of the other texts correlated with the D tradition, even though the gēr was not directly equated with a “brother” (TS and 4Q279), the gēr was associated with having an Israelite kinship, and would thus also by default represent a “brother.”

According to Shemesh, it appears that a “brother” is somehow “other than” an Israelite. This perspective seems best attributed to the present study’s examples of 4Q169 and 4Q174. The gēr in both 4Q169 and 4Q174 is a type of Judean convert (whether Pharisaic or follower of general Judaism, respectively), but the new Judean kinship of the convert is irrelevant. Due to the notion of genealogical impurity, according to these texts the legitimacy of the conversion is denied, therefore the gēr has never really attained this Judean status. A better way to describe the phenomenon, where the S tradition scrolls 4Q169 and 4Q174 are concerned, would be to describe that a “brother” is actually “more than” an Israelite or Judean. To be “more than” Israelite still requires an underlying foundational Israelite kinship. In other words, the Qumran movement member within the tradition of S is supra-Judean. While it seems that Judeans could convert into this supra-Judean state, someone perceived as lacking Judean kinship could not. Brothers included within the tradition of S must be supra-Judean, and the gēr of 4Q169 and 4Q174 is not, because of his perceived genealogical impurity.

This section confirms that kinship is clearly a component of Qumran ethnic identity. Furthermore, attaining Judean kinship may be either possible and mutable (in the tradition of D) or impossible and immutable (in the tradition of S). A fellow “brother” in the D tradition of the Qumran movement is Judean, while a fellow “brother” in the S tradition of the Qumran movement is “supra-Judean.” The perspectives of Berthelot and Shemesh both hold

---

13 The perspective also applies to 4Q423, but it was determined that because the document was found to be “presectarian,” i.e. preceding the Qumran movement’s specific “Teacher’s” traditions of D and S, the text would not be considered in the collated results pertaining to the Qumran movement in Chapter 4. However, recall that 4Q423 was instructional in providing a textual example whereby a gēr is employed to clearly mean a Judean convert to Judaism, even though this newfound Judean status is still not enough for the text’s intended ingroup. Because 4Q423 is an earlier text, this example demonstrates that an understanding of the gēr as a convert readily exists for all the other texts under consideration.
legitimacy. Can the present study find further evidence to confirm the theory that members of the S tradition are “supra-Judean”? In other words, what would elevate the status of a member of S to that of “supra-Judean”? The answer lies in the discussion of circumcision to follow in Section 4.3.

4.2 Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: Gēr’s Incorporation in the Promise of Land

The second dominant feature of Judean ethnic identity, that of a connection to a land, is also present within those DSS containing occasions where the term gēr has been employed. This section will collate the particular patterns whereby the comparison between the gēr of scriptural rewriting and majority scriptural predecessors highlighted the significance of the feature of a connection to land for Qumran ethnic identity. Often the feature of connection to land is demonstrated by means of inclusion in a promise of land, whether that be return to a land or the promise of a new land.

4.2.1 Connection to Land: The Promise of a Land of Honey

The theme of land arises in numerous fashions. First, 4Q377 and 4Q498 relate specifically to a promise of a land of honey. Despite the finding that 4Q377 appears more correlated with the tradition of D, and 4Q498 more correlated with the tradition of S, there is a strong thematic connection between these two texts. In 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 1-9, God’s voice is inserted into Moses’ Sinaitic presence to forge a promise of a new land for a new time and place, fashioned out of allusions to a promise of a land flowing with milk and honey from Exod 3:8. The new land offers a new meaning for the gēr; his insider status is confirmed by the fact that he is not included in Exodus’ list of foreigners who will be replaced. 4Q498 contains textual parallels and allusions to a land of honey found in both Deut 8:7-10 and also 2 Kings 18:35. The context of 4Q498, which promises a land of honey, is seemingly different from the land described in Deuteronomy 8 and 26. The rewritten context of the new land of honey in 4Q498, liberated from the sociohistoric context of Deuteronomy, also
liberates the gēr to take on a new meaning different from that of resident alien. A connection also exists to Prov 24:13 and its reference to honey. It appears that this land of honey will be granted when the Commandments are kept. The gēr in both cases seems best described as a non-Gentile; the new context frees the gēr to be a Judean convert who is included in the Israelite promise of a land of honey.

With regard to these two fragmentary scrolls, the question arises as to what exactly the reference to honey implies, other than a general reference to plenty. Multiple texts may be found concerning a theme in which honey is equated with law or wisdom, starting in the earlier, and strengthening throughout the later, Second Temple period. Chapter 3, in its study of scriptural rewriting pertaining to 4Q498, called attention to Prov 24:13 which instructs to eat honey “for it is good”; 24:14 furthermore equates wisdom with honey in its sweetness for the soul: “Know that wisdom is such to your soul.” In the parascriptural text Joseph and Aseneth, Aseneth is commanded to eat honeycomb by a heavenly man as a part of her conversion process to Judaism (Chapter 16). In the narrative, the honeycomb is associated with immortality and life, reminiscent of the promise made to the Israelites in Deuteronomy 30 whereby they will receive life so long as they love YHWH and follow the commandments. Consequently, the honeycomb seems to represent Torah. The honeycomb in Joseph and Aseneth may represent Torah also through the lens of Sir 24:19-22, which describes the memory and possession of Wisdom as sweeter than honeycomb. Multiple passages from late Second Temple scripture refer to honey, as well. Psalm 19, a Torah psalm, describes the ordinances of YHWH to be sweeter than honey (vv. 10-11), while Psalm

14It is feasible that the connection between law and honey exists as early as the period prior to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 586 B.C.E., based on Ezekiel’s consumption of a scroll that tastes like honey, in Ezek 3:1-3. The scroll eaten is not clearly defined as Torah, however. Further discussion also rests on the date of composition, which is debatable. See, for example, Paul M. Joyce, Ezekiel: A Commentary (LHBOTS 482; New York: T&T Clark, 2007), Introduction, 1–62.
16Concerning the honeycomb in Joseph and Aseneth, Edith Humphrey writes the following: “God’s laws, no doubt understood here through Sir. 24.20 in terms of wisdom, is sweeter than honey from the comb.” Edith M. Humphrey, Joseph and Aseneth (GAP; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 97.
119, another Torah psalm, mirrors closely Joseph and Aseneth’s allusion to consuming the law: “How sweet are your words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth (v. 103).” By the late Second Temple period, wisdom and law appear to be synonymous, by means of their mutual description as honey. Consequently, for the authors of 4Q377 and 4Q498, a tradition of wisdom and law is important, because of these scrolls’ multiple references to honey. Land is also connected, perhaps by means of legal stipulations that, if followed, will bring about the promised land of honey.

4.2.2 Connection to Land: Land Inheritance and Lots

As a second fashion in which a theme of land is observed, 4Q377 and 4Q279 each have in common a theme of land inheritance and lots. 4Q377 Frag. 1, 1, 4 refers to an inheritance, this time in the verbal form “to cause to inherit” (להנחיל). Two majority scripture passages which use this verbal form are the wisdom-oriented Prov 8:21 and exilic-themed Isa 49:8, the latter of which offers a promise of inheritance, presumably one of land. Portrayed in 4Q377

---

17 Apart from Proverbs, the other above texts may be ascribed to the late Second Temple period or shortly thereafter. Joseph and Aseneth, even though subsequently utilized by Christians, in its composition is arguably a Hellenistic Judean work with a provenance possibly from Egypt, and may date somewhere between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. See Randall Chesnutt, From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), Ch. 8; Humphrey, Joseph and Aseneth, 115. The original Hebrew work of Ben Sira was composed by Yeshua son of Eleazar, son of Sira, between roughly 190-180 B.C.E. in Jerusalem, with a translation into Greek by his grandson written sometime between 120-117 B.C.E. See, for example, Alexander A. Di Lella and Patrick W. Skehan, The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 1–16. Psalm 19 is seen as a composition of two layers, namely an appropriated Canaanite hymn to the sun (vv. 2-7 [Eng. 1-6] followed by a postexilic Torah psalm (vv. 8-15 [Eng. 7-14]). See Ross J. Wagner, “From the Heavens to the Heart: The Dynamics of Psalm 19 as Prayer,” CBQ 61 (1999): 246. Finally, Psalm 119 may be dated to the late Second Temple period. Jon Levenson argues that although the psalmist’s primary theological influence is Deuteronomy, making a date for the psalm in the period of Ezra and Nehemiah a possibility, in fact certain Deuteronomic key concepts such as “covenant” are missing. This finding, along with the fact that the psalmist receives his laws from teachers and elders, spiritual experience, and wisdom, leads Levenson to suggest that the psalmist’s Torah is not limited to the Pentateuch. See Jon D. Levenson, “The Sources of Torah: Psalm 119 and the Modes of Revelation in Second Temple Judaism,” in Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross (ed. Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 559–74. Levenson’s comment concerning the nature of the “Torah” calls to attention a wider debate, not engaged by the present study, regarding the exact nature of “wisdom” and “law” described in the texts of the late Second Temple period. For an overview concerning the varied subtraditions involved in wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible and late Second Temple period, see Collins, Jewish Wisdom.

18 4Q423, Frag. 5, 3 also refers to an inheritance (נחל), which calls to mind the land inheritance promised to the Israelites in Deut 26:1-2. The passage is not included in the collated textual examples above because it was found to precede both the D and S traditions.
as a recipient of land inheritance himself, the *gēr* makes most sense as an Israelite, rather than as a Gentile.

4Q279, Frag. 5, 4-6 also alludes to land inheritance with a reference to lots (sg. גָּרִים). These lots may be lots of an apportioning of light. They may simultaneously refer to land inheritance promises made to Israelites, such as Num 36:2’s promise of land inheritance to be apportioned. Either way, the *gēr* is included in the promise of the inheritance. That a *gēr* should be included in an inheritance (of land) offers a marked divergence from majority scriptural predecessors wherein resident aliens do not own land, and once again suggests a Judean identity.

### 4.2.3 Connection to Land: Promise of Land Return

A third fashion in which the texts display a connection to land, very much connected to the prior two, is an emphasis on the promise of land return, evident in 4Q307 and 4Q520. The texts of 4Q307 and 4Q520 conjure majority scriptural predecessors which draw on the theme of a return to a preinhabited land. 4Q307 Frag. 1, 6 contains a *gēr* who “remains,” which calls to mind a remnant returning to the land of Judea after the exile, especially reminiscent of Ezra 1:4 in light of a reference to “Israel among the nations” in Frag. 1, 7. The remnant *gēr* of Frag. 1, 6, when combined with the reference to appointed times in Frag. 7, 2, also invokes the future promise of exiles returning to the land of Judea from Jer 24:1. The *gēr* in fact seems to substitute for the returning Israelite, and therefore represents the Israelite (Judean).

In 4Q520, the abandonment of the *gērîm* (Fragment 45) may draw from majority scriptural predecessors describing Israel’s abandonment (Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4). When combined with the promise of Isa 45:17 that Israel has been saved (Fragments 1 and 18), the text calls to mind a promised return to land. Because the *gēr* in 4Q520 is substituting for the Israelite, who is promised return to the land, this *gēr*
consequently becomes a recipient of the promise. 4Q520 appeals to the future prophetic imagery of a ǧēr who will be called to return to a land; no direct reference to land is necessary.

4.2.4 Connection to Land: Significance of Birth and/or Livelihood in the Land of Israel

Finally, a fourth fashion in which the theme of land emerges in TS and 4Q159, whereby there is significance to a ǧēr’s living in the land of Israel. The present study follows the reconstruction in 11QTa XL, 6 regarding ǧērîm who were born specifically “in Israel.” 4Q159, Frags. 2-4, 1-2 describes an Israelite selling himself to a ǧēr or to the offspring of the family of a ǧēr “in the presence of Israel.” This specific location is an addition to the scriptural predecessor Lev 25:47-55. The reference to selling oneself to the offspring of the family of a ǧēr in the presence of Israel implies that the ǧēr originated in Israel. In both cases it is important for the proselyte to have a connection to the land of Israel. One notes both of these passages are correlated with the D tradition, which makes sense in light of the fact that it is D which permits the inclusion of converts to Judaism. However, the inclusion of the Gentile convert to Judaism, where TS and 4Q159 are concerned, is not fully mutable; rather, this convert must still at least have been a Gentile born in Israel (i.e., stemming from a lineage of previously immigrated foreigners). This presence in Israel more strongly roots the ǧēr in the land, along the lines of those third generation Edomites and Egyptians (Deut 23:8-9 [Eng. 7-8]) who may subsequently enter the assembly of YHWH, which suggests an assumed Israeliite kinship and ethnicity through naturalization.

4.2.5 Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: Conclusions

What can be discerned from the multiple texts that draw heavily on themes of land, a land in which the ǧēr is included? The present study has revealed that a notion of shared kinship and also a geographic connection to a land, both common ethnic identity markers, are relevant for
not only late Second Temple Judaism more generally, but also the Qumran movement specifically. Indeed, Esler argues that “territory is frequently a dimension of ethnicity.”19 The gēr’s inclusion in a promise of land is a strong indicator that the gēr is included within the ethnicity of the group to whom the promise and the land belong. The gēr of these passages pointedly contrasts against majority scripture where the gēr is not included in land inheritance. For example, the gēr of 4Q279 who is included in the receipt of a lot, inverts passages such as Deut 26:11 where a gēr does not receive a lot. The gēr of these passages also pointedly contrasts against foreigner figures of the nokrî and the zār who instead pose as a threat to land and its inheritance for Israelites. For example, consider 4Q501 4QApocryphal Lamentations B, 1: “Do not give to strangers our inheritance, nor the fruit of our labour to foreigners” (נחלתנו ויגיענו לבני נרך אל תתן לזרים).20 The stark contrast of the gēr’s inclusion within the inheritance, against the warning toward these foreigner figures, all the more strongly alludes to the gēr as an Israelite and member of the Qumran movement and not merely a resident alien.

Instead, the gēr is included within multiple texts that draw on themes of land, whether that be a promise of land inheritance and lots (4Q377; 4Q279), an allusion to postexilic land return (4Q307; 4Q520), pointed references to a gēr originating in Israel (11QTa XL; 4Q159), or a community who is promised a land of honey (4Q377; 4Q498). This section has demonstrated that for the Qumran movement, just as for late Second Temple Judaism more generally, the ethnic feature of connection to a land is mutable, just as is that of shared kinship. For some texts (TS 11QTa XL; 4Q159), the feature of connection to land can also be immutable, when the gēr’s place of birth is not Israel. Texts correlated with the Qumran

---

19 Esler, Conflict and Identity, 71. Stephen Hultgren observes a connection specifically between the “Damascus covenant” and a theme of exilic return to the land. See Stephen Hultgren, From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 66; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 162–63. Jutta Jokiranta refers to this theme observed by Hultgren within D as one of sojourner (i.e. that members of the D tradition see themselves as sojourners). Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing Ger,” 675. The present study sees the theme of a promised return to land as one among many within a connection to land as a feature of ethnicity.

20 Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 79. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
movement generally, and the tradition of D specifically, are found to permit mutability of this feature. These features of connection to a land and shared kinship are also interconnected, since it is a gēr’s new Judean kinship which permits a connection to the land to unfold.

4.3 Common Culture in the Covenantal Practice of Circumcision as a Feature of Qumran Ethnic Identity

Thus far, the present chapter has now confirmed the importance of the ethnic identity features of kinship and connection to a land, which are significant for the Qumran movement just as for late Second Temple Judaism. Both features have the ability to be mutable (or not) and consequently play a significant role in identifying the gēr as a convert, as well as understanding the gēr’s subsequent inclusion or exclusion. The gēr in texts correlated with the D tradition (CD x2; TS; 4Q377; 4Q159; and 4Q279) is always a Gentile convert to Judaism, as is the gēr of rabbinics, and is always included in the Qumran movement—albeit with the restriction that he must have been born in the land, according to TS and 4Q159. In contrast, regarding the texts 4Q169 and 4Q174 which correlate with the S tradition, the study has found that the gēr, even as a Gentile convert to Judaism, is excluded from the movement for reasons of genealogical impurity. A “brother” for the S tradition is someone “more than Judean,” or “supra-Judean,” and it appears that this special kinship is immutable for a newfound Judean who was a prior Gentile, despite being converted.

Because the features of kinship and connection to a land are mutable within the Qumran movement and arguably permit conversions, at this time the study looks at another feature of ethnicity, found to be an important marker of conversions within general late Second Temple Judaism, which is the ethnic feature of common culture as witnessed in the covenantal practice of circumcision. If the present study argues that the gēr within the Qumran movement is a convert, then a study of the practice of circumcision within the DSS will be in order to help prove this claim. As it happens, a study of circumcision will also further explain the differences in identity between the traditions of D and S, in particular the
“supra-Judean” status of members in S that prohibits the acceptance of Gentile converts into their movement.

4.3.1 The Common Culture of Circumcision:
Overview According to Pre and Post-Hellenistic Influence

The act of circumcision did not serve as a marker of Gentile conversions in the Persian pre-Hellenistic Second Temple period. With regard to Exod 12:43-49, which describes the inclusion of circumcised non-Israelites in the Passover festival, Rainer Albertz suggests that Holiness legislators composed this passage to permit a “controlled religious integration of the alien inhabitants of the province.”

Albertz notes that it is the act of circumcision which acts as the medium for this controlled integration. The reason for this regulation, argues Albertz, is that the Passover festival is the only domestic ritual over which the Jerusalem Temple did not exert control, and some mechanism was needed at the local level to oversee that “not all types of people participated in the domestic Passover.” In this case, the act of circumcision in this Persian period does not serve to treat aliens “in a way that would fit the proselytes of later periods.”

In a similar vein, ancient Israelite covenants in general did not represent a change in ethnicity, even though they were a way to extend the protective reach of individual kinship groups. According to Scott Hahn, in the scriptural context of ancient Israel, covenants “functioned as a legal means to integrate foreign individuals or groups within the familiar

21 Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 61.
22 Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 62.
23 Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 66. On the matter of circumcision, Jakob Wöhrle takes a similar view to Albertz with regard to Exod 12:43-49, in addition to Gen 17:9-14. Wöhrle argues that circumcision in these pre-Hellenistic passages “cannot be understood in the sense of proselytism.” Wöhrle concludes that the texts are “directed only toward the integration of alien persons, who live in the land, and not toward the integration of alien persons in general.” Jakob Wöhrle, “The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision,” in The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East (ed. Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle; BZABR 16; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011), 71–87; direct citations from 84 (x2). It is in this fashion that Wöhrle’s argument is similar to that of Albertz, namely that circumcision is for controlled integration of a growing diverse population within Persian Yehud, an integration that will permit the land to remain holy.
structure of society.” A covenant entailed more than simply a legal contract, and incorporated other dimensions such as the familial. Hahn believes that the purpose of a covenant that forges what he calls a “kinship covenant,” is to forge family ties amongst those who might otherwise be foes, or also to strengthen existing ties. Oath swearing sealed the act of covenant. Hahn lists scriptural examples of Abraham and Abimelech (Gen 21:22-34); Isaac and Abimelech (Gen 26:26-33); and Jacob and Laban (Gen 31:43-54). These covenants span across different sorts of relationships, including between two Israelite ancestors (Abraham and Isaac) and a Philistine. Hahn also looks to the work of Frank Moore Cross, who uses the term “legal fictions” to describe the same mechanism of kinship covenant:

In tribal societies there were legal mechanisms or devices—we might even say legal fictions—by which outsiders, non-kin, might be incorporated into the kinship group. Those incorporated, an individual or a group, gained fictive kinship and shared the mutual obligations and privileges of real kinsmen.

The method of oath and covenant included as a way to share in the obligations and privileges of “real kinsmen” is not the same as the change in ethnicity entailed for a non-Judean to convert to a Judean identity. Abraham, Isaac, and Abimelech may have forged covenants for the sake of peaceful relations, but Abimelech remained as a foreigner to Abraham and Isaac, and vice versa.

However, due to Hellenism’s influence within the late Second Temple period, the act of circumcision as a practice of common culture could signal a sign of conversion by those non-Judeans who performed it. Shaye Cohen argues that for Josephus, the narrative of the Roman Metilius saving himself by “judaizing (ioudaizein) as far as circumcision” (J.W.

25Hahn, Kinship, 8.
26Hahn, Kinship, 37.
27Hahn, Kinship, 41.
28Hahn, Kinship, 43.
2.454) makes clear that circumcision is the point where “adherence” ends and “conversion” begins.” In other words, the practice of circumcision as a sign of the covenant with YHWH is equally a mutable feature of the ethnic identity that changes in a conversion to Judaism of the late Second Temple period. Furthermore, this practice of circumcision is regarded to be a normative and important feature not only for converts but also for Judean identity in general, made evident by a number of Judean and Gentile writers in the general time period under discussion.  

In the DSS, physical circumcision is never included as a ritual for the admission of new members. CD III, 12-15 describes a covenant with God that yielded revelations including holy Sabbaths, appointed times, righteous testimonies, true ways, and the desires of God’s will; no circumcision is mentioned. Nevertheless, both physical circumcision and nonliteral circumcisions are described in both texts correlating with D and S, and therefore the feature of common culture in circumcision seems to be an integral part of membership in the Qumran movement in some way. Because these passages alluding to circumcision are not located within the occasions of scriptural rewriting where the term gēr has been employed, they have not yet been assessed. At this time, however, the present study will assess these references and discern whether there are any trends relating to circumcision between the D and S traditions, and what these trends might reveal about differences between the D and S traditions and attitudes toward conversion of the gēr.

-----------------------------

30 Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus,” *HTR* 80, no. 4 (1987): 427, see also 416, 418. To be clear, one must remember that Cohen, who has been seen to argue in favour of a mutable religious practice (common culture) and citizenship (connection to land), does not argue in favour of a mutable notion of kinship as a part of an ethnic identity. See the Introduction chapter, section 1.2.2.

31 For example, see Philo *Spec. Laws* 1.1-11; Josephus *Life* 113; Tacitus *Hist* 5.5. See also Jdt 14:10. For further textual examples and discussion on circumcision as an important aspect of early Judaism, see Cohen, “Crossing,” esp. 26–27; also Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness”.
4.3.2 Circumcision in the DSS Part I: Allusions to Physical Circumcision as a Reminder of Complete Covenantal Obedience in the D Tradition

Two passages concerning the physical act of circumcision are found within D. First, CD XVI, 4-6 rewrites Abraham’s initial circumcision from Gen 17:9-14 in the following manner: “And on the day when a man takes upon himself (an oath) to return to the Torah of Moses (לשוב אל תורה משה), the angel Mastema shall turn aside from after him, if he fulfills his words. Therefore, Abraham was circumcised on the day of his knowing (בֶּן כָּךְ בִּעֲנֵי יַעֲשָׂר).” A second passage, located within 4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6, draws on the regulations concerning women and childbirth of Leviticus 12, and the circumcision of male children: “And on the eighth day the flesh of his] foreskin [shall be circumcised” (וּוְיָמַן הָשָׁמֶרִי יָמַן בּוֹשֶׁר).

These passages in D allude to the physical act of circumcision. The first passage identified (CD XVI, 4-6) describes the timely and absolute obedience of a person turning to the Torah of Moses, which is then paralleled with Abraham’s own circumcision. The reference is too vague to denote a specific practice of circumcision at the time of joining the movement. Instead, the reference to circumcision appears to denote the immediacy and the need to follow through with one’s faithful intentions, whether that be with regard to an initial circumcision into the Abrahamic covenant, or obedience in the Torah of Moses as it pertains to the covenant of the Qumran movement. The second passage, 4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6, draws upon the custom of circumcising an infant at eight days after birth. Even though a ritual of circumcision for Gentile converts is not extant within the writings of D, the presence of these

---

32 CD XII, 10-11 also appears to allude to the act of circumcision, when a man is prohibited from selling his servants who have also entered the covenant of Abraham (בֵּן כָּךְ בִּעֲנֵי בֵּרְכַּי אֲבָרְנָם). However, the passage does not actually refer to circumcision (from the root מָלַק), and there is no way to know any details concerning the full identity of the servants.

two passages alert readers to the fact that physical circumcision was a known cultural feature within the tradition of D. Knowing the importance of circumcision to Judean identity within late Second Temple Judaism by its frequent presence as a literary topic, and knowing the importance for the D tradition of maintaining a covenant with God, it is hard to imagine that the tradition of D would not require circumcision for all members, including those born to parents within the D tradition, and converts. Feasibly, the absence of a ritual of circumcision for the Gentile gēr-convert in D might suggest that the D tradition accepted individuals who had already converted to general Judaism and had already been circumcised.

More important than noting the absence of a ritual of circumcision for converts in D, however, is to note the absence of an explicit restriction to eighth day circumcision. Neither of the two identified references to circumcision in D (one describing Abraham’s adult circumcision and one describing the circumcision of a baby on the eighth day after his birth) explicitly restrict circumcision to eighth day circumcision only. The passages are not at all exclusive to the extent explicitly recounted in Jub 15:14 and 15:25-26, as a contrasting example, whereby anyone not circumcised on the eighth day is destined for destruction.34 The absence in the rule of D of a ritual of circumcision for converts does not negate the gēr’s status as a Gentile convert to Judaism. One may presume that at the time of joining the movement, these members were already circumcised.

Overall, these two textual examples of circumcision from D imply an awareness of actual physical circumcision. This circumcision serves as a reminder for immediate obedience to a covenant, once revealed. Furthermore, circumcision is described as occurring

34Jub. 15:14 reads as follows: “The male who has not been circumcised on the eighth day—the flesh of whose foreskin has not been circumcision on the eighth day—that person will be uprooted from his people because he has violated my covenant.” Jub. 15:25-26 reads as follows: “This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. 26 Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover, there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God.” Translation from VanderKam, *Jubilees, an Edition.*
at eight days after birth, but this description does not contain any wording that would definitively restrict circumcision to that time frame.

4.3.3 Circumcision in the DSS Part II: Circumcision of the Heart as Spiritual Obedience in the S Tradition

A total of five passages within DSS material refer to a spiritual and metaphorical circumcision of the heart. \(^{35}\) ¹QPesher to Habakkuk XI, 12-13 refers to “the priest whose shame prevailed over his glory, 13 for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart” (הכוהן כיא לוא מל את עורלת לבו). \(^{36}\) Based on a proposed reading by John Strugnell, ⁴Q177 ⁴QCatena A Frag. 9, 8, which he has reassembled as Frags. 7, 9, 10, 11, 20, 26, line 16, may have a reference to “take away the foreskins of their fleshy heart in the last generation” (חרון ריוו וערלות לשבם). \(^{37}\) ⁴Q434 Barkhi Nafshi Frag. 1, I, 4 contains the phrase “And he has circumcised the foreskins of their heart” (ומול עורלות לבם). \(^{38}\) ⁴Q504 Words of the Luminaries Frag. 4, 11 contains a fragmentary entreaty to “circumcise the foreskin of [our heart]” (ומול עורל ללבנו). \(^{39}\) Finally, ⁴Q509 Festival Prayers Frag. 287 contains the lone reconstructed phrase to “circumcise [the] foreskin of our heart” (מולה עורלת לבנו). \(^{40}\)

\(^{35}\) A complete list of these passages may be found by combining the partial lists within the following: Martin G. Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians,” in The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo; JSJSup 71; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 82; David Rolph Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart’ in ⁴Q434 Barki Nafshi,” RevQ 17 (1996): 532.


\(^{37}\) Strugnell, “Notes en Marge,” 243–45. Strugnell’s reading differs from that of Allegro’s in DJD V, which is the following: “. . . [of foreskins to lead them aright in the [ast Generation]”. \(^{38}\) Hebrew text and translation from Moshe Weinfeld and Rolph Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” in Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 2 (eds Esther Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 270–71; same as that found in Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart’,” 532, and n. 16.

\(^{39}\) Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 154–6. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

\(^{40}\) Baillet, Qumran Grotte 4: III, 214.
Not all of the passages identified above clearly correlate with the Qumran movement generally or with either the D or S traditions more specifically. Some have been suggested to either predate the Qumran movement or to not contain any vocabulary particular to the Qumran movement. First, even though David Rolph Seely and Moshe Weinfeld suggest a sectarian origin, George Brooke makes the argument that the composition of the *Barkhi Nafshi* hymns (4Q434-438) “could have been in non-sectarian circles.”

Brooke argues thus because he does not consider there to be any vocabulary particular to the Qumran movement in the *Barkhi Nafshi* documents. Eileen Schuller is another scholar who suggests that *Barkhi Nafshi* may predate the Qumran movement. Second, concerning 4Q504 (one of the manuscripts containing *The Words of the Luminaries*), the document’s proposed dating to roughly 150 B.C.E. based on the Hasmonean handwriting style has elicited alternative provenance suggestions. Based on this early date, James Davila suggests that the work may be pre-sectarian and adopted by the Qumran movement for long term use. He concludes that evidence does not point strongly one way or the other with regard to a Qumran movement provenance for the work. Here, too, Schuller suggests that the manuscript date of 150 B.C.E. indicates a realistic “somewhat earlier” date of composition, in the pre-Maccabean era (pre-160/150 B.C.E.). In that case, the work would predate the Qumran movement.

Finally, due to lack of “technical terminology” related to the Qumran movement, Davila

---

41 George Brooke, “Body Parts In Barkhi Nafshi and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. Daniel Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 79. For the argument that *Barkhi Nafshi* is indeed sectarian, see Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi.” Specifically, they suggest that the language and themes of the *Barkhi Nafshi* hymns are similar to those found in other texts esteemed to be sectarian. Second, they argue that the language suggests a real historical event at which point the community was hidden and protected among Gentiles, before being delivered, and suggest this theme relates to that of exile within CD. See Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” 258–59.


suggests that 4Q509 Festival Prayers may have been composed elsewhere and adopted for use by the Qumran movement.\(^{47}\)

On the other hand, two of these passages relating to circumcision of the heart clearly correlate with the Qumran movement, and the S tradition specifically. \(1QpHabakkuk\) clearly correlates with the S tradition, stemming from the pesher tradition and its reference to the Council of the Community (צעתvidia) in XII, 4. Likewise, 4Q177 \(4QCatena\ A\) correlates with the S tradition because there are numerous references within the document, whether extant or safely reconstructed, to the Community (vida), which is the term associated to the S tradition: 4Q177 I, 1, 16; II, 10, 13; III, 5. Even if the other texts predate the D and S traditions, it is clear that a correlation is forged between the S tradition and its adoption of the theme of circumcision of the heart. The tradition of D, on the other hand, never uses that specific theme of circumcision of the heart.\(^{48}\)

This correlation observed between a reference to circumcision of the heart, and Qumran movement members affiliated with the S tradition, is indeed confirmed by a similar passage found in the Rule of the Community 1QS. 1QS V, 4-5 also describes spiritual and metaphorical circumcision: “No man shall wander in the stubbornness of his heart, to err following his heart, his eyes, and the plan of his inclination. He shall rather circumcise in the Community the foreskin of the inclination (ורלת יצריאאם למולgium עור) (and) a stiff neck.” The passage is found within the rule for the men of the community (1QS V, 1, והזרךלאנסיא, העיד). The “inclination” (ץער) in fact may be seen as synonymous with the “heart” (לב).\(^{49}\)

Furthermore, 1QS V, 26 regulates that a community member should not hate his fellow in the following manner: “And he must not hate him [in the foreskin] of his heart”


\(^{48}\)CD XVI, 9-10 stipulates that a member should “re[turn t]o the Torah of Moses with all (his) heart [and with all] 10 (his) soul,” but this general reference to Deut 6:5 is not a reference specifically to circumcision of the heart.

\(^{49}\)Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart’,” 532–33.
1QS and the S tradition clearly contain, even if adopted from earlier nonsectarian or presectarian circles, a theme of circumcision of the heart.

Noticeably these circumcisions of the heart are metaphorical and spiritual. First, a metaphorical meaning is assumed, because members of the Qumran movement certainly would not be performing heart surgery. Beyond this obvious metaphorical observation, these circumcisions are spiritual because the majority scriptural predecessors from which they are borrowed and reinterpreted indicate a concept of spiritual obedience. Predominantly, the reference to circumcision of the heart correlates with the passages Deut 10:16 (“Circumcise, then, the foreskin of your heart, and do not be stubborn any longer”); Deut 30:6 (“Moreover, the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, so that you will love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, in order that you may live”); and Jer 4:4 (“Circumcise yourselves to the LORD, remove the foreskin of your hearts”).

Werner Lemke argues that Jer 4:4, taken together with Jer 6:10 (describing an uncircumcised ear) and Jer 9:24-25 (describing an uncircumcised heart), signify either spiritual obedience or disobedience. More generally, Roger Le Déaut suggests that within majority scripture, circumcision of the heart “made precise the conditions of an authentic entry into this covenant by a total free-will offering of self to God in obedience to his will.”

Likewise, Michael Knibb points out the connection to Deut 10:16 and the command to circumcise the heart and not to be stubborn, in 1QS V, 4-5. Knibb describes the stubbornness to be avoided as the “attitude of the person entering which must be one of complete


52 Le Déaut, “La circoncision du coeur,” 183. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.
sincerity.” In other words, circumcision of the heart represents not only full obedience to YHWH and the covenant of Abraham, but in the case of 1QS, the obedience is more specifically to the special “covenant of God” undergone by movement members. Entering this covenant means walking perfectly in all the ways of God, according to 1QS III, 9-10. Le Déaut explains that the theme of circumcision of the heart “is utilized to illustrate the moral conditions of a life of perfection in the new covenant.” Circumcision of the heart, seen as spiritual obedience in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, is rewritten in the same fashion into 1QS and the S tradition, albeit specifying obedience to a covenant solely for the S tradition.

Ironically, Lemke suggests that the theme of conformed spiritual obedience within the earlier traditions of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah eclipse to a reemphasis of a physical or ritualized circumcision in Priestly perspectives elucidated in such texts as Ezek 36:27 and 44:7-9. This comment is not to say that the traditions behind Deuteronomy and Jeremiah did not advocate physical circumcision, alongside the language of circumcision of the heart, intended to encourage spiritual obedience. However, one could ask whether this spiritual circumcision into the movement’s eternal covenant means that a physical circumcision is no longer required where 1QS and the S movement is concerned. Just such a notion has been argued by Sandra Jacobs, who asserts that the movement at Qumran did not follow the rite of circumcision. She argues thus for two reasons. First, as has already been noted, the ritual of circumcision is not specifically identified “as a requirement for the future redemption of Israel in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” By this statement, Jacobs means that no ritual of circumcision as a conversion ritual for new members is described in either the rules of D or S. And second, circumcision was regarded within the Greco-Roman era in a negative manner.

---

53Knibb, Qumran Community, 91.
as it was “considered a disfiguring social stigma.”\textsuperscript{57} However, in light of the fact that two passages regarding physical circumcision were observed within the D tradition, it seems very unlikely that the S tradition is omitting a physical circumcision. Furthermore, even where late Second Temple period Judean authors appear to acknowledge that circumcision was not necessarily universal among all individuals and communities, the writers nevertheless advocate for physical circumcision as normative.\textsuperscript{58} Therefore, more likely is the conclusion that the Qumran movement affiliated with the S tradition is rather adding a secondary, metaphorical and spiritual circumcision, in addition to an initial physical circumcision.

4.3.4 Common Culture in Circumcision as a Feature of Qumran Ethnic Identity: Conclusions

Despite the fact that no ritual of physical circumcision is described for new members within any of the Qumran movement rules located in D or S, this section noted that circumcision is nevertheless a theme present within the D and S traditions, suggesting that circumcision has a role to play within the Qumran movement. Instead of concluding that the absence of a ritual describing physical circumcision means either that all converts are prohibited, or even that circumcision itself was of no concern to the Qumran movement, the section discovered that circumcision is in fact an important indicator of identity for both the traditions of D and S. Where the D tradition is concerned, circumcision is a reminder of complete and immediate obedience to revealed covenantal regulations, whether they be Abrahamic or related to the Torah of Moses. Because Gentile converts are accepted into the D tradition, and D’s references to physical circumcision are not explicitly restrictive to eighth day circumcision only, circumcision appears to be mutable and permitted for Gentile converts. Where the S tradition is concerned, there is no mention whatsoever of physical circumcision. Instead, a

\textsuperscript{57}Jacobs, “Expendable Signs,” 575.

\textsuperscript{58}For example, John Collins and John Nolland both accept that Philo describes uncircumcised proselytes in QE 2.2. Collins suggests that for Philo, the matter is not that it is permissible to abandon circumcision, but rather that circumcision may only be required upon entry into a Judean community (and not prior to it). Nolland argues that Philo still has an expectation that converts should be circumcised. Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness,” 173–74; John Nolland, “Uncircumcised Proselytes?” \textit{JSJ} 12, no. 2 (1981): 173–79, esp. 179.
“circumcision of the heart” is identified on numerous occasions. The two passages regarding physical circumcision in D suggest that for the tradition of D, physical circumcision is a normative feature of identity. It is unlikely that the related Qumran movement tradition of S would obliterate the need for circumcision; therefore, the “circumcision of the heart” appears to be a second circumcision which is metaphorical and spiritual in nature, and describes the authentic state required to follow the Torah of the new covenant specific to the S tradition. Both the circumcisions of D and S and their respective traditions represent a type of covenantal obedience, but the circumcision in D emphasizes full and immediate compliance, and the circumcision in S emphasizes the spiritual intention behind compliance. The second circumcision performed by an S tradition member would represent becoming “more than Judean,” or “supra-Judean.”

The S tradition reworks majority scripture concerning a “circumcision of the heart” to describe the special nature of that covenant, which can only be attained because members have transformed to a Judean nature which is even more spiritual than that of general Judaism. Because the imagery chosen is that of circumcision, and circumcision is a significant part of Judean conversions, it appears that members of the S tradition see themselves as a type of convert, too. Therefore the reason that Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts to Judaism in the S tradition is because, in fact, members of S believe that they are converts to supra-Judaism. The issue is not so much that Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts, but rather that supra-Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts, because these converts were never esteemed to have become Judean in the first place. Only a Judean can become a supra-Judean.

This convert status could explain the specific choice in vocabulary הנסוה עליה (1QS V, 6), used to describe those who joined the movement. As explained in Chapter 3, the term
nilvîm in the late Second Temple period assumes a meaning of “converts.” This convert status could possibly also explain the inclusion of a gēr convert in those texts (4Q307; 4Q498; and 4Q520) whose correlations with the traditions of D or S were indeterminate. If the texts correlated with the D tradition, the inclusion of the gēr Gentile convert to Judaism would fit with the present study’s established findings. If the texts correlated with the S tradition, however, one might at first be confounded as to why the S tradition would exclude the gēr on some occasions (4Q169; 4Q174), and on others, include what seems to be the same Gentile convert. However, if these texts happened to pertain to the tradition of S, the gēr’s inclusion would make sense when one takes into account that members of the S tradition see themselves as a kind of convert, too. In this case, the gēr could possibly be a self-referent to members of the S tradition themselves.

4.4 Qumran Ethnic Identity Chapter Conclusions

Overall, this chapter discovered that the convert status of the gēr in the DSS relies heavily upon the ethnic features of shared kinship, connection to a land, and common culture in the covenantal practice of circumcision. Each of these features can be either mutable, or immutable. Furthermore, the secondary circumcision of the heart, made evident in the tradition of S, revealed to a fuller extent the differences between the traditions of D and S, and explained why members of the S tradition consider themselves to be “supra-Judeans.”

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 collated the findings from Chapter 2, which assessed the likelihood of a D or S tradition provenance in the occasions where the gēr is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, and Chapter 3, which compared the occasions of the gēr employed in scriptural rewriting with majority scriptural predecessors and uncovered the important features of shared kinship and connection to a land. Section 4.1 assessed the ethnic features and connection to a land.

---

59 See Ch. 3 of the present study, discussion in section 3.3.1. It should be noted that D also makes use of the verb לוה in CD IV, 4-6. However, in this case, it has been suggested that the verb is being used as a pun on “Levites,” borrowing from Ezek 44:15. See Grossman, “Priesthood as Authority,” 126–27. Members of the D tradition do not see themselves as supra-Judean converts in the manner of the S tradition.
feature of shared kinship in the Qumran movement. In cases whereby the gēr is included in the movement, the implication is that the gēr’s kinship has changed to that of the group. The gēr is a brother, who is Judean (Israelite), and therefore the gēr is also Judean, regardless of whether the gēr is still lower in the movement’s hierarchy. In cases where the gēr is excluded from the movement, it is because kinship is considered immutable and the legitimacy of the gēr’s conversion is denied. It is the D tradition which permits mutability of kinship for the gēr to represent a Judean brother; it is the S tradition which denies mutability of kinship for the gēr (in 4Q169 and 4Q174). For the S tradition, the brother is “beyond” Judean kinship.

Section 4.2 assessed the ethnic feature of connection to a land. While the feature of land is not as dominant thematically as the feature of kinship, the gēr is included in a connection to the promise of land in texts clearly correlating with the D tradition (TS 11QTa; 4Q159; 4Q279; and 4Q377), and in texts with a more general Qumran movement affiliation (4Q307; 4Q498; and 4Q520). In texts correlated with the D tradition specifically, this feature of the gēr’s participation in the promise of land can serve as a hinge that links the mutability of the features of kinship and land. The component of land, in particular the fact that the gēr now receives an inheritance or lot, inverts the gēr’s previous resident alien meaning to one of Israelite (Judean), linking the components of land and kinship. The connection to a promise of land may also be immutable, in some cases, if the gēr is not born in Israel. For many of these passages dealing with land (4Q279; 4Q307; 4Q377; 4Q498; and 4Q520), even though Qumran movement members are already within the land of Israel themselves, clearly varied sentiments exist: either they are waiting on the promise of a new land, or the promise of return to a land.

Section 4.3 investigated an additional important ethnic feature related to the gēr. Because the feature of common culture in the practice of circumcision was found to be significant for conversions in late Second Temple Judaism more generally, this section
assessed whether the feature holds significance for conversions attested in the Qumran movement, too. The section found that circumcision is significant for the Qumran movement, even if no ritual of circumcision is described within entrance procedures, and in fact shed insight into the differences observed in mutable and immutable ethnicity between the D and S traditions. Two different themes of circumcision were found to be present within the DSS. A theme of physical circumcision was present in the D tradition, and a theme of a circumcision of the heart was present in the S tradition. The circumcision of the heart identified in the S tradition suggests a “second” conversion is required for members, above and beyond a physical one. To this end, where the S tradition is concerned, even to be “Judean” is not enough, and Judeans themselves must “convert” by means of circumcision of the heart to become more than Judean, or supra-Judean, in order to join what is a new covenant. It appears that this supra-Judean status prohibits the membership of Gentile converts to Judaism, who are believed to have never relinquished their Gentile ethnicity in the first place. Without a baseline of Judean kinship, one cannot join the S tradition; supra-Judean ethnicity is closed to those yet perceived to be Gentiles. Meanwhile, the D tradition, which does not conform to a circumcision of the heart, believes that Gentile converts have fully become Judean brothers and are permitted entry and membership within the group.

The next chapter will offer a sociohistorical comparison to brother language used in Greco-Roman associations to determine whether the conclusions of the brother, with whom the gēr is equated in the DSS, may truly represent a notion of shared kinship, and more broadly shared ethnicity, among members across various groups. The comparison will more fully serve to confirm or deny the contemporary reality of ethnic mutability in the Qumran movement observed through the process and choices made in employing the gēr in scriptural rewriting in the DSS.
Chapter 5
Sociohistorical Comparison between the Qumran Movement and Greco-Roman Associations

Chapters 2-4, the first part of the present study, were rooted in the textual strategy of scriptural rewriting. The study assessed changes observed to the gēr as the term was employed between scriptural rewriting in the DSS and majority scriptural predecessors. It assessed these changes within the parameters of each text’s provenance to the Qumran movement’s traditions of D or S, and forged conclusions concerning the meaning of the gēr as a “convert” within the two traditions of D and S, as well as the mutable (and sometimes immutable) ethnic identity of the Qumran movement more broadly. Within scriptural rewriting in the DSS where the term gēr was employed, dominant features of mutable or immutable ethnicity mirrored those evident in late Second Temple Judaism generally: a shared notion of kinship; a connection to land; and common culture in the practice of circumcision. Chapter 5 proceeds to the second part of the thesis’ method, namely a sociohistorical comparison to the findings made from the literary and textual evidence of Chapters 2-4. The purpose of the comparison is to reassess the findings made on textual and literary grounds against a more concrete sociohistorical backdrop.¹

Comparisons are made to another type of group which is similar to the Qumran movement’s organizational make-up, namely Greco-Roman associations. As discussed in the introduction chapter, the possibility of ethnic conversions within the Qumran movement is in response to the Hellenistic milieu in which the Qumran movement finds itself; therefore, it is appropriate to use Greco-Roman associations as the type of group(s) against which to

¹See the introductory chapter’s discussion within section 1.3 regarding the rationale for conducting a sociohistorical comparison in addition to textual and literary findings.
compare, in this second part of the study. Greco-Roman associations, and the sectarian groups related to D and S traditions within the Qumran movement, offer a good point of comparison: both overlap in time frame and also contain many parallels in the arena of group rules. The rules of D and S contain many points of similarity to those of various Greco-Roman associations, including rules overseeing acceptance of new members, laws and penalties, candidate probationary periods and code renewal.

Greco-Roman associations are also chosen for comparison because they contain references to member as “brothers,” reminiscent of the brother references observed within the DSS. In the scrolls, these “brothers” were found to represent Judeans, and sometimes even “more than Judeans,” and always represented a shared notion of kinship, though not cosanguinal kinship. The gēr employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS, as the primary term under scrutiny in the present study, was frequently equated with a “brother.” The “gēr,” however, is a term unique to Hebrew scriptures and Judean tradition. Thus it is this brother language which can be used as comparison between contexts. Scholarship acknowledges that the brother references of the Greco-Roman associations also need not represent solely “real” or “blood” (cosanguinal) brothers, and in fact can imbue meaning into the contexts in which the term is found. Philip Harland has argued that “a pattern of usage is becoming clear” whereby the term brother can represent “fellow-functionaries” and not merely cosanguinal

---

2See the Introduction, section 1.2.2, concerning the adoption of Hellenistic ideals of choosing a “civilized” legislative law code as an instigator more generally to choosing ethnicity and converting across groups.
3Weinfeld, *Organizational Pattern*, esp. Chs. 4-7. See the Introduction chapter of the present study, section 1.3, pp. 45-46, and n. 161 for further references to studies which offer comparisons between Greco-Roman associations and the groups affiliated with the Qumran movement. See also the following for a clear example of bylaws pertaining to an association: John S. Kloppenborg, “Associations in the Ancient World,” in *The Historical Jesus in Context* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Jr. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan; Princeton Readings in Religions; Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006), 332–35.
4The meaning of “cosanguinal” is to be related by blood. Individuals with cosanguinal ties may also be called “cognates” or “consanguines.” The terms all represent relationship between individuals by filiation (links between parent and children, and consequently between siblings), and also descent (going back a number of generations of filiation). See, for example, Parkin, *Kinship*, 8–9, 15, 35.
brothers within the Greco-Roman context. Accordingly, Harland convincingly argues that “there is no reason to minimize the significance of familial expressions of belonging within non-Christian, Greco-Roman contexts.” A study of the associations’ use of nonconsanguinal brother language will serve as a helpful comparison to the brother language identified in the occasions where the term gēr has been employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS.

Elsewhere, scholarship has also scrutinized nonconsanguinal brother references within the letters of Paul. Within the authentic letters (Romans; 1 and 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Philippians; 1 Thessalonians; and Philemon) the term is used in a nonconsanguinal fashion on one hundred and thirteen occasions. However, while early Christ groups also convey similarities to Greco-Roman associations and also to early Judean groups, Pauline letters do not contain a “rule” or bylaws as witnessed in Greco-Roman associations and the Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community. Furthermore, Greco-Roman inscriptions have not undergone the level of editing or change as that which is considered to have taken place within the Pauline corpus. For example, there is no need to discuss the “authenticity” of

---

5 Harland looks to examples whereby various cultic association functionaries are identified as either “brother priests” (IGLAM 503 a and b); “good, brother under-priests” (IMylasa 544); or “brother hieros” (herios being the god, MAMA X, 437). Harland convincingly argues that “[i]t would be difficult to explain these cases away as references to real brothers who happened to be fellow-priests.” Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities (New York; London: T & T Clark, 2009), 69–70. English translations provided by Harland.

6 Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 66.

7 This information draws from Appendix 1, excluding sister and consanguinal sibling references, as found in Reidar Aasgaard, ‘My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!’: Christian Siblingship in Paul (Early Christianity in Context: JSNTSup 265; London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 313. With regard to scholarly consensus on the corpus of genuine Pauline letters, see David Trobisch, Paul’s Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins (Bolivar, Miss.: Quiet Waters Publications, 2001), 44–47.

8 Philip Harland observes that “common ground” in the “expression of belonging and group identity” may be observed between associations, synagogues, and congregations (i.e. early Christ groups). Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 80.

Greco-Roman inscriptions.\textsuperscript{10} For these reasons, the present study will make some comparisons to the “brothers” and the arguably mutable kinship of the first century C.E. Paul, but only within the context of the primary comparison to “brothers” of Greco-Roman associations.\textsuperscript{11}

Specifically, Harland argues that within associations or guilds, noncosanguinal brother references represent “relations of solidarity, affection, or friendship.”\textsuperscript{12} While Harland argues in favour of “brother” language to represent solidarity and friendship within the milieu of Greco-Roman associations, the present study takes the question further: can “brother” language signal a mutable notion of shared kinship?

The present chapter will argue that while this representation of friendship for brother language appears to be the case in professional associations whose primary identity is not based on the features of ethnicity, a sense of newfound shared kinship between previously noncosanguinal “brothers” is evident in cultic associations where ethnic identity features are dominant. Affiliation with a particular deity and the added presence of kinship language represent the two primary features of ethnic identity (kinship and culture). The inscriptions illustrate that references to “brothers” do not need to represent cosanguinal relationship. However, upon joining cultic associations, members appear to assume a notion of shared kinship in a socially-constructed manner, akin to what is argued by ethnicity theorists. The

\textsuperscript{10}Jonathan Hall discusses the need for literary comparanda “where the contextual material is ‘thick’,” and suggests that difficulties arise where, by way of example, “evidence is spread more thinly and where such evidence as does exist often derives from authors living several centuries after the events they describe.” Editorial layers or uncertain authorship of books (i.e. pseudepigraphical authorship) could be construed within this concern. Hall, \textit{Hellenicity}, 24.

\textsuperscript{11}Denise Kimber Buell and Caroline Johnson Hodge both consider Paul to conceive of “Christianity” as an ethnicity that is mutable. See section 5.3.2 of the present chapter, and also pp. 29-30 of the Introduction chapter.

\textsuperscript{12}Philip A. Harland, \textit{Dynamics of Identity}, 81.
notion of shared kinship between brothers is evidenced in the use of both nuclear family and adoption language. This finding means that while these “brothers” are not cosanguinal from birth, effectively they become so after having joined the association. The comparison to the possibility of brother language signifying mutable kinship in Greco-Roman associations will uphold this study’s claims that brother language supports mutable kinship within the DSS. Therefore the chapter will not only confirm the study’s unique findings concerning the ġēr’s status of shared kinship with other members of the Qumran movement; it will also discover new findings regarding the shared kinship that “brothers” assume upon joining Greco-Roman cultic associations, as well.

In assessing Greco-Roman associations in the general terms of “professional” and “cletic,” and not, for example, in Harland’s category of “ethnic,” the ethnic make-up of members joining Greco-Roman associations may be more blended than within the DSS under consideration. In that movement, individual Gentile converts join a group whereby predominant ethnic membership is already Judean. The present study acknowledges that such a comparison is not exactly parallel. Evidence is scarce for an adequate study of ethnic-based Greco-Roman associations into which members from other ethnicities are welcomed as members. Therefore, the use of brother language for the comparison is upheld.

---

13According to Robert Parkin, “[s]trictly, a nuclear or elementary or conjugal family consists merely of parents and children, although it often includes one or two other relatives as well.” Parkin, Kinship, 28. A Roman familia consisted of “an adult male Roman, the paterfamilias, lawfully married, with children born to him and his wife (or successive wives), together with the children, if any, of sons (and their sons, and so on in the male line only, through as many generations as might be simultaneously alive).” Jane F. Gardner, Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life (Oxford; New York: Clarendon, 1998), 1. The inscriptions within the present study refer to “fathers,” “sisters,” and “brothers,” permitting the more basic meaning of a nuclear family to stand. It should be noted that the present study does not equate a nuclear family with a Roman “household,” which in addition to cosanguinal kin, could also include friends, freedmen, slaves, and others. Jane F. Gardner and Thomas Wiedemann, The Roman Household: A Sourcbook (London; New York: Routledge, 1991), 7–9.

14See Section 5.1 below and n. 18.

15Harland identifies one example of an “ethnic association” from Attica in the third century B.C.E. that mentions the presence of a “Samaritan” member (although Harland iterates that “it is unclear whether this is an Israelite (who honors the Israelite God) or a non-Israelite from Samaria”). Philip Harland, trans., “Honours by a Society for Leaders Mentioning a Samaritan Member IG II1 2943,” in Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Companion to the Sourcebook.
While others, such as Harland, describe these brother references as “fictive kinship,” this chapter will instead continue to refer to these brother references as “noncosanguinal”—even when a subsequent status of shared kinship between association members is established. The chapter uses the term “noncosanguinal brothers” to contrast against both references to cosanguinal (sometimes identified by scholarship as “real”) brothers from birth (e.g. Gal 1:19), and also against the notion that any kind of brotherhood that is not cosanguinal from birth must be merely “fictive.” While modern Western society now has a narrow view concerning the constitution of kinship circles, the same is not true globally, and is certainly not true for the ancient Mediterranean. Indeed, the first part of the thesis has already established that in the Qumran movement, brother language signifies more than something which is merely “fictive.” Instead, brother language signifies a notion of shared kinship to the extent that purity concerns (within the tradition of D) are no longer an issue for the gēr—a Gentile convert to Judaism—who is himself now a “brother.”

5.1 Greco-Roman Associations: An Introduction

Private Greco-Roman associations, or “collegia,” also known as voluntary associations, traditionally have been distinguished in the categories of professional and cultic. Specific funerary associations are also argued to exist, whose primary purpose was to arrange for the burial of members. However, it has been suggested that these associations were only

---

16 Concerning “real” brothers, see Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 313, Appendix 1. Concerning the term “fictive kinship,” the present study avoids the term to instead emphasize the perception of authenticity of new kinship bonds formed within associations.

17 See n. 124 in the Introduction chapter of the present study.

18 Cultic” associations are also frequently called “religious.” For example, see James S. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter Varsity Press, 1999), 74–77. Jeffers also identifies household and burial associations. Other taxonomies have also been recently used to organize association types. Philip Harland identifies five types of associations: household connections; ethnic or geographic connections; neighbourhood or locational connections; occupational connections; and cult or Temple connections. The present study will utilize the basic organizational categories of professional and cultic associations for simplicity. Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 30–52. See also Kloppenborg, “Associations,” 323–24. Kloppenborg describes associations organized around the following groupings: extended family; common cult; ethnic identity; and common profession, with levels of overlap existing between the categories. Kloppenborg, “Associations,” 323–24.
established during the reforms of Hadrian, reigning from 117-138 in the second century C.E.\textsuperscript{19} Most associations in either professional or cultic categories also appeared to take care of funerary matters of members, as will be observed in a number of the inscriptions that follow. Membership drew from a variety of nonelite people, including men, women, freedmen, and slaves, although not all would be found necessarily within each association.\textsuperscript{20} Professional associations were generally formed of members in a common profession or a common location and existed as social clubs.\textsuperscript{21} Cultic associations formed around particular deities.\textsuperscript{22} Based on the findings of the present study, the Qumran movement may not seem closely connected to the “social club” descriptor of a professional association, and consequently one might argue that to compare the DSS brother references with brother references in only cultic associations would be adequate. However, according to John Kloppenborg, “one cannot in principle exclude the possibility that professional collegia occasionally leaned in the direction of cultic associations too.”\textsuperscript{23} Thus the present chapter will compare noncosanguinal brother references within both broadly-reaching categories of professional and cultic associations.

In what follows, written references to noncosanguinal brothers have been collected from within epigraphic and papyrological evidence found in either Greek (\textit{adelphos}) or Latin (“\textit{frater}”).\textsuperscript{24} This chapter introduction has already indicated that certain “brothers” will be found to assume kinship status subsequent to joining associations; the point presently noted is the fact that the following references to “brothers” do not indicate original cosanguinal relationship (i.e., brothers from the time of birth). While a wide range of references are

\textsuperscript{20}Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations}, 52–53. Also, Kloppenborg, “Collegia and \textit{Thiasoi},” 23.
\textsuperscript{21}Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations}, 38–44; Kloppenborg, “Collegia and \textit{Thiasoi},” 19–20, 24.
\textsuperscript{22}Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations}, 44; Kloppenborg, “Collegia and \textit{Thiasoi},” 25.
\textsuperscript{23}Kloppenborg, “Collegia and \textit{Thiasoi},” 22.
\textsuperscript{24}Unless otherwise noted, translations for inscriptions are my own.
identified, the study does not claim to be fully comprehensive.25 The references that are used fall primarily between the first to third centuries C.E., which exceeds the scope of the DSS texts under consideration. They are also broadly reaching within the Roman Empire, while the DSS under consideration are presumably limited to the region of Judea. Nevertheless the organizational similarities between Greco-Roman associations and the Qumran movement suggest the comparisons may still be significant despite the time and geographic differences.

5.2 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Professional Associations

A few inscriptions from professional associations, in both Latin and Greek, have been found to refer to members as brothers in a noncosanguinal fashion.

*Industria V 7487 (CIL V 07487)* was the first inscription acknowledged by scholars to contain a brother reference which is noncosanguinal. The inscription is contained on a small paper fragment dating to the second century C.E. found in Monteu da Po in the Italian province of Liguria, with only the words “fabri fratres” (“smith brothers”).26 It is clear these “brothers” were members of a professional association, and the letters themselves have the tendency of an actuary.27 Even though the only two words existing on the fragment are the reference to “smith brothers,” it seems unlikely that these professionals would all belong together as cosanguinal brothers. While *CIL V 07487* was not only the first, but at one time was considered in fact to be the only example of a professional association describing members as brothers,28 other examples have now been compiled as well.

25 Other additional association references made specifically to members as “brothers,” in addition to what will be covered in the present chapter, may also be found in Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 63–81.
Stemming from the heart of the Empire in Rome, *CIL VI* 09148 (*ILS* 7333) describes an association of treasurers (“arcario”), of whom one is described to be “fratri piissimo” (“the most pious brother”). This association of treasurers has been recognized to be a professional association and does not seem comprised of cosanguinal brothers. A certain slave is also mentioned, “Chreste Arescon.” In other circumstances this figure could indicate that the association is actually that of a household collective within which owned slaves would also be included. In such a case, the brother reference would be cosanguinal. However, it seems quite unlikely that an entire household would also be comprised of treasurers. The brother reference is neither cosanguinal nor within the context of a nuclear family, and refers to a fellow association member.

Another example from Rome of a professional association in which members refer to one another as “brother” in a noncosanguinal fashion is *CIL VI* 467 (*ILS* 3360). This association, self-described as “collegium velabrensium” (a college from Velabrum, a lower part of Rome), has been categorized as a professional association in the wine trade. In this inscription, a caretaker of the association is described as “instaurator fratrib(us) suis” (“restorer of his brothers”). The inscription opens with a reference to “Deo Sancto numini / deo Magno Libero” (“God the holy deity / God the great and free”), which confirms that professional associations could also incorporate cultic elements. Nevertheless, the overall

28 In the late nineteenth century Jean Pierre Waltzing wrote that *Industria V* 7487 was the only example of a professional association referring to members as brothers. Waltzing, *Etude Historique*, 329, n. 3.
29 The inscription reads as follows: “D(is) M(anibus) / Hermeroti / arcario v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXIV / collegium / quod est in domu / Sergiae Paullinae / fecerunt / Agathemer(us) / et / Chreste Arescon / fratri piissimo b(ene) m(erenti)” in collaboration with Anne Kolb and Michael Rathmann, “CIL 06, 09148”.
30 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 112, and n. 42.
31 For a general reference to *CIL VI* 467 as representing a professional association, see Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 112, n. 42. With regard to the identification of this association’s affiliation to the wine trade, see Robert Palmer, “Severan Ruler-Cult and the Moon in the City of Rome,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neuern Forschung II*, vol. 2.16.2 (ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase; Principalat; Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1978), 1119, and n. 211.
32 The inscription reads as follows: “Deo Sancto numini / deo Magno Libero / Patri et Adstatori / et Conservatori / h(uus) l(oci) coll(egium) / velabrensium / Domitius secundus curat(or) instaurator fratrib(us) suis.” in collaboration with Anne Kolb and Michael Rathmann, “CIL 06, 00467”.
33 It is likely this reference to a deity that caused Waltzing to label *CIL VI* 467 as belonging to a religious cult. Waltzing, *Etude Historique*, 329–30, n. 3.
sentiment of the inscription is one of roles and responsibilities among a profession’s associates.

Associations’ use of noncosanguinal brother references extend beyond Italy and throughout the Roman Empire. For example, two closely-related examples from Roman Egypt of noncosanguinal brother references used within associations are *P. Ryl. IV 604*, a private letter likely composed in Antinouopolis in the third century C.E., along with *PSI III 236*, a letter composed in the third or fourth century C.E. and stemming from Oxyrhynchos. Robert Daniel observes that both papyri use the term *adelophos* to refer to “members of the same or related guilds.” Because *PSI III 236* deals with a professional guild of athletes and entertainers, he concludes that *P. Ryl. IV 604* also refers to a professional association of athletes. *P. Ryl. IV 604* refers to four different individuals as “brother” (using *adelophos*): “that my lord the hegemon is in good health. And now therefore I have written about him to brother Eutolmius (line 12)”; “and I have written about brother Heraiscus (line 15) to the same Eutolmius, introducing him”; “Brother Apynchis (line 28) salutes you. I pray for your health, brother (line 31)”; and “Forward the enclosed letter, which is sealed with (my) ring (?), to Alexandria to brother Theodosius (line 33) by a dependable friend.” *PSI III 236* refers to three different individuals as “brother” (*adelphos*) as well. Scholarship confirms that these “brothers” are not “blood brothers” (per Daniel) or “real siblings” (per Harland). Instead, the familial language used is intended to describe relationships between association members.

---

35 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40; see also Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 78.
37 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40.
38 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 38–39; see also Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 78. Harland collates the occasions where named individuals are referred to as “brother.”
Another papyrus, also stemming from Egypt, serves to illustrate one reason why fellow-members from associations may refer to one another as brothers. Even though many private associations took care of members’ funerary matters, other associations functioned specifically as professional guilds whose members provided undertaking services. One such case is PPetaus 28 (AGRW 290), a private letter on papyrus with a provenance in Kerkesoucha Orous (Arsinoites, a division of Herakleides, Fayûm, Egypt) that dates to the second century C.E. ⁴⁰ According to Daniel, both the writer and recipient of the letter are likely members of a professional guild of undertakers, whose responsibilities include “not only embalming and burial, but also, as in this letter, the transportation of the dead.” ⁴¹ The letter is to do with the transport of the corpse of a Roman legionary, which a member named Papsaus had sent to another member, Asklas. The corpse was then to be forwarded to a final destination, but because it did not arrive, Papsaus faced disciplinary action and wrote to Asklas to follow through with the task. The letter opens παψαυ ᾃ ἀσκλα τω ἀδέλφῳ πολλὰ χαίρειν (“Papsaus to Asklas his brother (adelphos), many greetings”). Harland concurs with Daniel’s conclusion that the term adelophos was a not a “conventional, meaningless [term] of address.” ⁴² Instead, the term reflects an everyday means for association members to address one another, and in this case, to call upon a fellow association brother, who “was sought for help.” ⁴³ 

The appeal to brotherhood was not always offered necessarily as a positive entreaty, but instead as a negative reproach. IG X.2.1 824 is a third century C.E. epitaph from Thessalonica that reveals a tendency within one association of members having in the past

---


⁴³Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 80.
reopened tomb niches either to add another body, or even to remove the remains of the deceased person within: “For Tyche. I have made this niche in commemoration of my own partner out of joint efforts. If one of my brothers (τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου) dares to open this niche, he shall pay.” Onno van Nijf suggests that the intent of the epitaph may be to discourage “any fellow association members having designs on a specific tomb or niche.” This example contrasts brother language used for the purpose of negative reproach against other examples which demonstrate positive entreaty.

A seventh and final example can be identified of a noncosanguinal brother reference utilized within what seems likely to be a professional association, in *IKilikiaBM II 201 (= PH 285220 = AGRW 215).* This example dates to the first century C.E. in the period before Vespasian (i.e. pre-69 C.E.), and has a provenance in the vicinity of Lamos in central Rough Cilicia. The inscription is on one of a series of tombs carved in mountain rock and belonging to an association’s collective burial site. Since the leader of the association, along with four of the members, are immigrants from Selge in Pamphylia, and Selgian immigrants were “particularly prominent in the profession of masonry,” it is possible that this association is one of professional masons. The inscription regulates that the tomb should remain for the sole use of association members; if a member wishes to leave the group, the other members may buy it from him, or the member may be refunded his share in the tomb. Most intriguing is that the term used to refer to fellow members in the described transactions is “brother” (*adelphos*): “if some brother (*adelphos*) wants to sell, let the other brothers (*adelphoi*) purchase it. But if the brothers so wish, let them receive the coins mentioned

---

44 Onno M. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17; Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997), 46; see also Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 71, who makes reference to van Nijf. For the inscription in Greek, The Packard Humanities Institute, “IG X.2.1 824”. English translation is that found in van Nijf.


46 Harland suggests that the association’s membership may also be comprised of “immigrants to the area.” Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 69.

47 Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 68; see also Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, *Sourcebook, AGRW* 215. English translation is from *AGRW*.

above and let them depart from the association.” This association of immigrants and possibly professional masons are not related cosanguinally: all the members listed are described as being a “son of” different fathers. Thus the references to brother are used to refer to all group members in a noncosanguinal fashion.

In sum, each of these examples demonstrate various professional associations using the term “brother” in a noncosanguinal sense, although the intended nuance of the term appears to vary. The reference to the brother may be a manner in which to refer to all group members equally, such as the “smith brothers” of Industry V 7487 (CIL V 07487), the multiple members identified as brothers in P. Ryl. IV 604 and PSI III 236, or the rules that apply to all member “brothers” in IKilikiaBM II 201 (= PH 285220 = AGRW 215). References to the “brothers” as equals does not preclude the ability to set some “brother” members apart as particularly honourable, however, such as the treasurer who was “the most pious brother” of CIL VI 09148 (ILS 7333). Successful accomplishment of a task that benefitted the association or the undertaking of a particularly important role in the association appears to be a reason to elevate certain “brothers,” such as the possible wine trader who was the “restorer of his brothers” identified in CIL VI 467 (ILS 3360). Finally, the term also appears to be used for the purpose of one member attempting to evoke feelings of brotherly honour and duty from other members, such as that observed by “Papsaus to Asklas his brother” in PPetaus 28 (AGRW 290), and even shame, if this honour is not upheld, observed in IG X.2.1 824.

None of these examples from professional associations concretely suggest that the use of “brother” language represents a mutable notion of shared kinship among association members. Harland’s conclusion appears accurate, namely that the term denotes family ideals of “solidarity, goodwill, affection, friendship, protection, glory, and honour” between association members.49 Professional associations appear to be exactly what the name

49Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 81.
suggests: associations of individuals whose primary commonality is a shared profession, whether they be smiths, treasurers, wine traders, athletes, undertakers, masons, or something else. Nothing further can be suggested. Ethnic features are not dominant in professional associations. Even when a professional association does lean in a cultic direction (such as the reference to revering a particular deity in *CIL* VI 467), which could signal the presence of other mutable features of ethnicity, nothing suggests that the brother language represents the ethnic feature of shared kinship. The use of brother language alone to denote fellow members is not enough to signify mutable shared kinship, and consequently shared ethnicity, among these brothers.

5.3 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Cultic Associations

5.3.1 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Nuclear “Families” and Hierarchical Relationships in Cultic Associations

References to brothers are also located within Greco-Roman cultic associations, which are affiliated with the worship of various gods.

Reidar Aasgaard argues that “most frequently the sibling metaphor was employed within the Mithras cult,” since inscriptions call the initiates “brothers” (“fratres”).

One example may be noted in *CIL* XIV 4315 (*CIMRM* 308), an inscription on a small cippus opposite the theatre of a Mithraeum in Ostia Antica southwest of Rome, and dates to the first quarter of the third century C.E. The inscription identifies two freedmen “brothers” who were torchbearers. The inscription confirms nonelite membership in the cult, and

-----------------------------


furthermore the unlikelihood that these “brothers,” both freedmen and torchbearers, would be related cosanguinely. A second cult of Mithras inscription, *CIL VI 727 (CIMRM 510)*, located in Rome on a marble base at the bank of a bridge on the Tigris river, and dating between 176-192 C.E., refers to the vow of two “brothers” (“Her/mioneo et Balbino fratribus v(otum).”)

In addition, both inscriptions also refer to “fathers.” *CIL XIV 4315* refers to a “victorious father” (“Victori patri”). *CIL VI, 727*, which opens with a tribute to “Soli invicto / Mithrae” (“Mithras, the only unbeaten”), also refers to a father who is the “procuratore kastrensi,” a term traditionally meant to represent the figure in charge of household financial matters. In the imperial household, a “dispensator fisci castrensis” was a slave chosen to govern the funds belonging to the patrimonium and utilized for domestic purposes, and functioned as a sort of palace administrator. Presumably the ”procuratore kastrensi patre” in *CIL VI 727* is in charge of that association’s finances, and the addition of the term “father” suggests his head status in the group. The cult of Mithras is especially known to contain references to “fathers,” who are argued to play some sort of leading role in the association. Indeed, the “brothers” in these two examples are reminiscent of the hierarchical function of “brother” language in the DSS as observed by Wassen and Jokiranta. The references to “father” and “brothers” denote membership and status, and furthermore mirror the language used among members of a nuclear family. In both examples of inscriptions related to the cult of Mithras, it appears that the “brothers,” whether they be torchbearers or those nonfinancial head members who make vows, are members while not leaders of the association.

52 The inscription reads as follows: “Soli invicto / Mithrae / pro salute Commodi / Antonini Aug(usti) domini n(ostri) / M. Aurel(ius) Stertinius / Carpus una cum Carpo / proc(uratore) k(astrensi) patre et Her/mioneo et Balbino fratribus v(otum) s(olvit) f(eliciter).” Vermaseren, *Mithriacae*, 204.
55 Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982), 71. According to Nock, within the cultic associations of Mithras and others, the head is referred to as the “pater.” Nock, “Importance,” 105.
56 See Chapter 4, pp. 164-65 of the present study.
A number of references exist to members as “brothers” in cultic associations aside from the cult of Mithras. *CIL* VI 377 is an inscription with a provenance in Rome, ascribed to the cult of Jupiter, evidenced by the opening “Aram Iovi Fulge/ratoris” (“altar to Jupiter Fulgeratoris,” meaning “Jupiter the Lightening Hurler”). The inscription refers to “brothers and sisters of dedication” (“fratribus / et sororibu(s) dedica/verunt”), which is different from the above-referenced cult of Mithras, into which Aasgaard argues only men were permitted as members. The “sisters” would be nonleaders of the association, like the “brothers.” The inscription also identifies a priest within the association (“sacerdos / Silvani”), denoting an individual with a higher role, as in those hierarchies listed in CD XIV, 3-6 and 4Q*Four Lots* 4Q279 (priests, Levites, children of Israel, and *gērîm*). These brothers and sisters are thus members, but not leaders, within this cultic association.

References to association members as brothers exist within inscriptions related to the cult of Jupiter Dolichenus as well, a cult which gained popularity within the second and third centuries C.E. A first example is *CIL* VI 406 (*ILS* 4316), which has a provenance in Rome and consists of a marble inscription broken into several fragments. The inscription opens with an honourific address: “B(onam) F(ortunae) / Ex praecpto I(oannis) d(olicheni) aeterni” (“Good Fortune, On instructions from the great and good eternal Jupiter Dolichenus”). The inscription proceeds to list the names and roles of followers of Jupiter

57 The inscription reads as follows: “Aram Iovi Fulge/ratoris ex pr(a)ecep/to deorum mon/iensium Val(erius) Cres/centio pater deoru(m) / omnium et Aur(elius) Exu/perantius sacerdos / Silvani cu<m=N> fratribus / et sororibu(s) dedica/verunt.” in collaboration with Anne Kolb and Michael Rathmann, “CIL 06, 00377”.

58 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110.

59 Categories of leadership can be divided roughly into “siblings” and “parents.” “Sisters” and “mothers” are the female equivalents to “brothers” and “fathers.” For example, where early synagogues are concerned, Bernadette Brooten points to six inscriptions, all from Italy and dating between the second and sixth centuries C.E., wherein references are made to “mothers” of the synagogue. Brooten concludes that these figures “had something to do with the administration of the synagogue.” The “mothers” have a higher level of authority in the association, albeit perhaps not as high as “fathers,” who have been established to represent the head of an association. Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 72.

60 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110. Aasgaard writes that “members of the Iuppiter Dolichenus cult (second and third centuries AD) seem to have called one another siblings.”

61 This inscription may be found in full in Monika Hörig and Elmar Schwertheim, *Corpus Cultus Iovis Dolicheni (CCID)* (vol. 106 of *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’empire romain*; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 246–47.
Dolichenus in a descending hierarchy, who are described as “fratres carissimos et collegas hon(estissimos)” (“most dear brothers and honourable colleagues”). It seems unlikely that cosanguinal brothers would refer to one another as “honourable colleagues.”

A second example of an inscription from a cultic association honouring Jupiter Dolichenus is that of CIL III 3908, which is an altar inscription from the Roman province of Pannonia, in Trebnje (present-day Drnovo in Slovenia). The inscription opens with a similar honourific address to Jupiter Dolichenus: “I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) D(olicheno)” (“the great and good Jupiter Dolichenus”). Within CIL III 3908, a secondary address is also given to Heliopolitan Jupiter: “et I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) H(eliopolitano)” (“and the great and good Heliopolitan Jupiter”). In this inscription, a member is identified as “Maxim/u fratibus” (“the eldest brother”), who pays merit. Likely this “brother” is the most senior in rank, not age, although the description is reminiscent of sibling hierarchy in a nuclear family. Despite the allusion to a nuclear family, the “brother” does not appear to be related cosanguinally to other members. Instead of a reference to cosanguinal relationship, Monika Höring and Elmar Schwertheim suggest that the term in this inscription takes on a meaning pertaining to a religious (meaning cultic) association.

Both examples highlight that group members within Jupiter Dolichenus cult associations were identified as “brothers,” but were nevertheless organized by a hierarchical ranking once again similar to the ranking observed in the DSS examples CD XIV and also 4Q279. In other words, “brothers” are members within a cultic association, but brotherhood does not signify that everyone ranks as hierarchical equals.

62 Höring and Schwertheim, Etudes Préliminaires, 247, n. re: lines 9 ff.
63 The inscription reads as follows: “I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) D(olicheno) / et I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) H(eliopolitano) / Aurelius Do- / mittius cu- / m Fl(avius) Casto- / re et Aur(elio) Maxim- / u fratibus e- / x iuso num- / inis v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).” Höring and Schwertheim, Etudes Préliminaires, 176, no. 274.
64 Höring and Schwertheim, Etudes Préliminaires, 176, no. 274. Regarding line 7: “Mit den fratres ist hier sicher eine religiöse Gemeinschaft gemeint.”
65 Recall that the language of brotherhood has been established by Jokiranta and Wassen to not equate with “egalitarianism,” both in the DSS correlated with the Qumran movement and in Greco-Roman society. Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 195, 203.
In the third century C.E., the cult of Bellona also used sibling terminology to identify association members. Stemming from Rome, CIL VI 2233 refers to a temple coin dedicated to “Bellonae pulvinensis,” which is an epithet for Bellona. One member is identified in reference to another as “fratri et / domino suo” (“his brother and his master”). Again, a hierarchical rank appears evident within membership.

These examples of brother references within Greco-Roman cultic associations demonstrate a strong hierarchical structure within the group, similar to what one would find within a nuclear family where primary authority was given to the paterfamilias. Indeed, multiple references appear to various “family” members: a “father” in CIL XIV 4315 and VI 727; and a “sister” in CIL VI 377. Furthermore, hierarchies exist among the “brothers” themselves: in CIL III 3908 an “eldest brother”; and in CIL VI 2233 a reference to “his brother and his master.” A. D. Nock suggests that the cultic association “is a family and feels itself as such.” Thomas Schmeller suggests that these familial references are the “fiction of a family.” Recall that the present study resists the term “fictive kinship.” Just because kinship is not cosanguinal does not mean that kinship is necessarily esteemed “fictive” by the members who hold the familial titles. Therefore, the brother, while not appearing to be

66 See Aasgaard, Brothers and Sisters, 110, and n. 25, for additional references regarding the cult of Bellona and use of sibling language. See also Waltzing, Etude Historique, 329–30, n. 3.
67 The inscription reads as follows: “L(ucio) Lartio Antho cistopho/ro aedis Bellonae pulvinensis / fecit C(aius) Quintius Rufinus fratri et / domino suo pientissimo cui et / monumentum fecit interius ag/ro Apollinis argentei Quintius / Rufinus.” See in collaboration with Anne Kolb and Michael Rathmann, “CIL 06, 02233”.
68 Simply put, John North writes that “wherever Roman citizens established themselves and lived by Roman laws, the legal structure of the family placed great control in the hands of the oldest living male progenitor – the paterfamilias. In theory, at least, so long as your father, or indeed grandfather, was still alive, you remained in his control (potestas): that meant that only he could own property, only he could make a contract, only with his consent could sons and daughters marry, or stay married once they were, or get divorced if they wanted to.” North, “Religious Pluralism,” 185. For an overview on Roman family hierarchy, see Jeffers, Greco-Roman World, 238–47. See also Gardner and Wiedemann, Roman Household, Ch. 1.
70 Schmeller writes that the familial references are “die Fiktion einer Familie.” Direct citation translations from the German are my own. Thomas Schmeller, Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine (SBS 162; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995), 48.
cosanguinal from birth, may subsequently uphold a notion of shared, mutable, kinship among members within these associations.

The following grouping of cultic association inscriptions from the Bosporus region (contemporary northern coast of the Black Sea) will add yet another meaning to shared kinship where “brother” references are concerned.

5.3.2 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Adopted Brothers in Cultic Associations and Beyond

The following inscriptions from the Bosporus region utilize brother language, and, in some cases, adoption terminology to describe the relationship among members. The purpose of cultic associations in the Bosporus region extended to “due burial of the members” and “education of the young,” in addition to “worship of certain deities.”

Harland suggests that what was first an informal use of “fraternal language” developed into the use of “fictive sibling language” as an official title. By way of example, Harland looks to CIRB 104 (AGRW 88), an early third century C.E. stone epitaph to mark the grave of a deceased association member, located at Pantikapaion in the Bosporus region. On the inscription the association calls the deceased member ἰδιος ἀδελφος (“its own brother”). Identical officers are listed on this epitaph from Pantikapaion as on inscriptions at Tanais, leading Ellis Minns to comment that this association behind CIRB 104 is a “precisely similar organization with the same purposes” as the association at Tanais. In other words, a progression is noted between CIRB 104 and the related inscriptions that now follow below.

---

71 Ellis H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus (Cambridge: University Press, 1913), 620. 72 Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 72–73. See references to CIRB 104 made also in Meeks, Urban Christians, 87, and n. 77; Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 624; and Nock, “Importance,” 105. 73 Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 73. For Harland’s full English translation alongside the Greek, see Philip Harland, trans., “AGRW 88 Grave for a ‘Brother’ of the Synod (200–250 CE): Pantikapaion - Bosporan Region,” in Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Companion to the Sourcebook: “For good fortune! Those gathered around the priest, Valeris son of Neikostratos, and the father of the synod, Kallistos the younger, and the rest of the members of the synod honored their own brother, Symphoros son of Philippos.” 74 Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 624.
Each inscription refers to ισποητοί ἄδελφοι σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὑψιστον (“the adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos”). The nature of the association that took on this name as its official title has been debated by scholars at length. On the one hand, the association has been considered a Jewish syncretistic cult. Because the members are referred to as σεβόμενοι θεὸς ὑψιστον, literally “those who fear Theos Hypsistos,” parallels have been drawn between this cultic association and those Gentile “Godfearers” of Judaism observed in the New Testament, such as Lydia in Acts 16:14, as well as women and men Gentile sympathizers of Judaism described by Josephus in Ant. 14.110 and 20.34. On the other hand, it has more recently been suggested that the association has nothing to do with Judean influence but rather a deity that has undergone Hellenistic influence. There is no evidence of Judeans living in Tanais, and furthermore, the term “Godfearer” can be applied to individuals beyond Judaism, and can only be ascribed to a particular faith “when contexts supply additional indications concerning their religion” (which the Tanais inscriptions do not). Therefore the association behind these Bosporus region inscriptions which use brother language may legitimately count as a Greco-Roman comparison to the DSS texts under consideration.

Critical to understanding the brother language of the Bosporus region inscriptions is the manner in which one should understand the reference to the association’s members as “adopted brothers” (ισποητοὶ ἄδελφοι). Legal adoptions occurred within both Greek and

---

75 CIRB 1283 may be found as an English translation in Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, Sourcebook, AGRW 92. The Greek alongside an English translation are also present at Philip Harland, trans., “AGRW 92 Dedication to Theos Hypsistos by the ‘ Adopted Brothers’ (228 CE): Tanais - Bosporan Region,” in Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Companion to the Sourcebook. CIRB 1281; 1285; and 1286 may all be located on the Packard Humanities Institute online database: http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/.

76 For example, Meeks, Urban Christians, 87; Aasgaard, Brothers and Sisters, 114. See also Minns, who writes that “the epithets of the deity are clearly due to Jewish influence.” Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 621, see also 622. Regarding Godfearers specifically, see also Ch.3, n. 22 of the present study.

77 Yulia Ustinova, The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom (RGRW 135; Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999), 238–39. See also Philip A. Harland, Dynamics of Identity, 73, and ns. 43 and 44, who refers to Ustinova, and also identifies other scholarship that ascribes to the earlier view concerning a Judean influence for these inscriptions.
Roman traditions, represented in both the verbs εἰσποιέω and also υιοθεσία, the latter being a newer term attested from the second century B.C.E. onward. In Greece, the institution of adoption arose generally for “a provision of family and testamentary law for the preservation of an oikos and its property.” In fourth century B.C.E. Athens, adoptions could occur for the purpose of a childless man having someone to look after him (and his spouse) in old age, to bury him properly, and to look after his tomb-cult. Because grown sons had legal obligations to care for their aging parents, having a son was the only safe way to ensure this care. Another purpose for adoption would be for an Athenian to interrupt the order of intestate succession and designate someone else to perform these tasks if he did not think the existing intestate heirs would successfully accomplish these tasks. The inheritance would be left to the adopted son.

Roman adoptions were primarily undertaken for the purpose of providing succession of inheritance and continuance of family sacra (“sacred rights”) for independent men who did not have any sons. The adoption was performed by legally independent and typically older men who did not have children but were capable of procreating. Grown men were the adopted, since adoption entailed the transfer of patria potestas (“power of a father”). Women, not having patria potestas, could not adopt and were rarely adopted. Adoption

---

81 Of course, any system is also open to forms of abuse. The tribal cycle of the priests of Athana Lindia, whereby “priests of the same tribe succeeded each other in office in 3-yearly intervals,” could be circumvented with adoption. According to Ellen Rice, “a priest of one tribe standing for election in a year which was restricted to a member of another tribe could be adopted by a man from a deme of the appropriate tribe, and so be eligible for the priesthood.” Rice, “Adoption in Rhodian Society,” 138, 141–42. See also Hugh Lindsay, Adoption in the Roman World (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 60–61, 218. Rubinstein, Adoption in IV. Century Athens, 62–63, 76–77.
82 In the later Roman Empire it seems that patria potestas was not always a concern, at least not in Roman Egypt. In P. Oxy. IX 1206, dating to 335 C.E., a husband and wife consent to the adoption of their two year old son. Nevertheless, the adopted son will become the heir of the adoptive father. Arthur S. Hunt, ed., The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. 9 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund: Graeco-Roman Branch, 1912), 242–44.
happened by way of *adrogatio* or *adoptio*. *Adrogatio* involved adoption of a legally independent male and involved investigation by the pontiffs. *Adoptio*, likely more common, took place in situations where the male adoptee was still under the authority of a *paterfamilias*. The existing *patria potestas* was broken and subsequently power was transferred to the new father. In both cases, the adoptee lost his right to inheritance in his family of origin, unless subsequently he became emancipated from the adopted father and would thus revert once more to the family of origin. The underlying point is that adopted sons were esteemed equal to natural-born sons.83 One could argue that they had effectively undergone a kind of change in kinship through the process of adoption.

Returning to the “Hypsistos-Fearing Adopted Brothers” from the Bosporus region, Franz Poland suggests that the “brother” of these inscriptions, although uncertain, is possibly a “real brother.”84 By comparison, Nock concludes that “this phrase [“the adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos”] is important, since adoption constituted in antiquity as close a tie as blood-relationship.”85 It is unclear whether Poland considers a “real brother” through the perspective of cosanguinal brothers from birth, or brothers who effectively assume the same parentage through the tradition of adoption. Certainly within the time period under consideration and within the tradition of Roman adoption, adoptive sons in their adoptive family were considered to be in the same legal position as real sons.86 Within the tradition of Greek and Roman adoptions, adopted children became like “real” children. Therefore, whatever Nock’s intention concerning “real brother[s],” the “Hypsistos-Fearing Adopted Brothers” could in fact represent persons of newfound shared kinship. Furthermore, the

shared kinship of the “ Adopted Brothers” in a way exceeds that of the brothers and gērîm employed in the DSS: the Bosporus region “ Adopted Brothers” have become like “real” brothers, subsequently legitimizing the claim of “real,” meaning cosanguinal, brotherhood.

The Bosporus inscriptions are not the only writings to use the Greek and Roman concept of adoption in the same manner: members joining a group with a connection to a particular deity, with these members also identified as “brothers.” It has already been noted that fellow followers of Christ are named “brothers” in Pauline letters. Some argue that Paul’s use of adoption language is to draw primarily on majority scriptural influences: Paul could have devised the language of adoption to symbolize Israel as God’s adopted son (for example from Hos 11:1). Or, as a second option, Paul could have devised the language of adoption from the account of Abraham’s adoptive son Eliezer who will not receive the inheritance (Gen 15:4), because a “real” son will replace him. Or, as a third option, Paul could have devised the language of adoption from a notion of King David as an adopted son, drawing on 2 Sam 7:11-16. Finally, some argue that Paul’s use of adoption language draws on a notion of Greek law. However, huiothesia, the term used by Paul, is firmly located within the Roman tradition of adoptions, and one will note that the communities to which he writes these letters, since they were under Roman rule, would recognize the connotations of Roman adoption in

87 See p. 191 of the present chapter.
88 For a discussion on the authentic letters of Paul, see, for e.g., Trobisch, Paul’s Letter Collection, 28–47.
the term’s use. Therefore one gets a sense that Paul approaches the language of adoption from the Roman perspective that adopted sons are equal to natural born sons, and therefore effectively undergo a change in kinship.

Scholarship has already argued that for Paul, becoming a follower of Christ entails a change in kinship and consequently ethnicity. Denise Kimber Buell argues against Christianity as something universal that is over and against kinship and ethnicity, an argument that she claims is often taken with respect to Gal 3:28. Instead, she suggests the following:

By construing Christianness as having an “essence” (a fixed content) that can be acquired, early Christians could define conversions as both the transformation of one’s ethnicity and the restoration of one’s true identity. And by portraying this transformation as available to all, Christians universalized this ethnoracial transformation.

Kimber Buell is arguing that Paul defines Christianity as an ethnic group, to which anyone may convert by means of a mutable ethnicity. In addition, Caroline Johnson Hodge argues eloquently that where Paul is concerned, “kinship and ethnicity cannot be merely metaphorical, for lineage, paternity, and peoplehood are the salient categories for describing one’s status before the God of Israel.” It can therefore be further argued that Paul intends

---

91Kimber Buell, Why This New Race, 138.
92Johnson Hodge, If Sons, Then Heirs, 4. Johnson Hodge and Kimber Buell (see above) have been used as examples because of their specific approach to Paul’s notion of kinship by drawing on ethnicity studies. For a selection of succinct perspectives that address Paul’s use of kinship in other ways (in addition to those sources already utilized in the present chapter for the perspectives of siblingship and adoption), see, for example, S. Scott Bartchy, “Undermining Ancient Patriarchy: The Apostle Paul’s Vision of a Society of Siblings,” BTB 29 (1999): 68–78 (who argues that Paul sought a sibling solidarity that was antipatriarchal); David M. Bossman, “Paul’s Fictive Kinship Movement,” BTB 26 (1996): 163–71 (who argues that Paul draws on household kinship and develops the construct of God as the patron Father); and David G. Horrell, “From Ἀδελφοῖς to οἱ θεοί: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity,” JBL 120 (2001): 293–311 (who compares the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline letters to conclude that a shift occurs over time in organizational structure from that of an egalitarian community to a hierarchical household-community).
these adoptions for “brothers” to instigate a change in kinship, seen as a requirement of a conversion for group membership.

The feature of mutable “Christian” kinship present in the adoption given to “brothers” within Pauline literature lends credibility to the notion that the “adoptions” undergone by the “Hypoints-Fearing Adopted Brothers” also represent a change in kinship to one which is shared among group members. Thus the brother language in this cultic association of the Bosporus region also demonstrates a mutable notion of shared kinship between group members, signifying an ethnic conversion for new members, just as for the “brother” gērîm of the DSS. In fact, that the brothers in this cultic association are “adopted” extends their notion of kinship beyond even that of the DSS, whereby the gēr is a brother who is related by kinship but not cosanguinity. Instead, the association’s adopted brothers are parallel to cosanguinal siblings, through the ideal of Greek and Roman adoption.

5.4 Shared Kinship and Mutable Ethnicity in the Brothers of Greco-Roman Associations: Conclusions

This chapter provided a sociohistorical comparison between the present study’s findings concerning the gēr as a convert within the Qumran movement, and Greco-Roman associations. Scholarship has already called attention to general similarities in organizational structure and time frame between the Qumran movement and Greco-Roman associations. This chapter compared the “brother” language within the DSS against “brother” language found within various Greco-Roman associations, both professional and cultic. In the DSS, where a gēr is found to be a convert by means of mutable ethnicity, “brother” language represents a notion of shared kinship between members. Brother language exists within papyrological and epigraphic evidence from Greco-Roman associations as well, and the chapter set out to discover whether the brother language used in this other ancient Mediterranean context could signal a mutable notion of shared kinship between group members, just as it was found to do in the DSS. If evidence of brother language could
demonstrate a mutable and shared kinship among new members, the finding would further
confirm the thesis’ conclusion that the gēr, who is frequently identified as coterminous with a
Judean brother, has made a change in kinship and ethnicity.

In short, the chapter concludes that indeed, brother language demonstrates a
newfound shared kinship among group members, but only in the associations whose primary
identity is based on ethnic features. The make-up of Greco-Roman professional associations
is not primarily based on ethnic features, since their raison d’être is simply the joining
together of individuals who share in similar professions. Here, the conclusion reported by
Harland holds true, that the purpose of brother language is to instill values of friendship and
honour. In the examples assessed, brother language was used to elevate the status of certain
group members, and also to encourage good behaviour.

However, once the study assessed the brother language used within the cultic
associations, whose primary feature was that of common culture in the act of revering
particular gods, brother language was found to represent a notion of shared kinship among
members subsequent to joining. First, brothers were found to assume kinship within the
model of a nuclear family; association members took on the titles of “father,” “sister,” and
“brother,” and hierarchy was evident between members.\(^{93}\) In this manner, brothers became
cosanguinal upon joining. Second, a certain association from the Bosporus region developed
a formal title of “Adopted Brothers.” Based on the understanding within Greco-Roman law
that adopted sons were equal to “real” sons, and furthermore that the language of adoption to
represent shared kinship among new members within “cultic” groups was also being used
elsewhere, the study concluded that these “Adopted Brothers” also shared in a mutable notion
of kinship. In their adoption, these brothers also became cosanguinal, like the brothers of
various cultic associations who joined, or converted, into “nuclear” families. With multiple
------------------------------------
\(^{93}\)No “mothers” were present within the examples under scrutiny; only examples that also contained “brothers”
were sought out for this exercise.
features of ethnicity present (common culture in religious or cultic practice; shared notion of kinship; and even a common proper name in the case of the “Adopted Brothers”), the specific addition of familial and sibling language suggests these groups have constructed an ethnic group along the lines argued by the “instrumentalist” pole of ethnicity theorists.

The above conclusions suggest that definitions of kinship, and models of brotherhood, are always group specific. Just as brothers are part of a “nuclear” family within some cultic associations, and represent “adopted” brothers in another, the “brother” of the Qumran movement is group specific, too. Within the tradition of D, the brother was found to be a Judean kin but not cosanguinal. Within the tradition of S, a brother would be “supra-Judean.” The chapter confirms the findings of the thesis, namely that the gēr, in his frequent identification as a brother, can represent shared kinship, and consequently shared ethnicity, with other members of the movement.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

This thesis set out to investigate the meaning of the term *gēr* within scriptural rewriting in the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). More specifically, the thesis analyzed whether the term *gēr* within the DSS affiliated with the Qumran movement could represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, just as it does in rabbinical literature. There are two reasons for this question: first, because of the very fact that the term *gēr* has been found to change in meaning over time, from a meaning of “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism”; and second, because Gentile conversions were witnessed from the Hasmonean era onward, which is the time frame established for the DSS. While scholarship has not favoured such an interpretation, more than one tradition present within the movement could yield multiple applications of the term and false initial impressions. Furthermore, even though the question is of scholarly interest, no monograph on this specific topic exists at this time. Therefore, the question demanded inquiry, and the present study is a contribution to this end.

Defining what is meant by a “conversion” was integral to the study of the term *gēr*. Within the ancient Mediterranean and Hellenistic milieu, persons could choose to change their ethnic identity, meaning that identity was mutable and constructed. The study established that ethnic identity is understood to consist of features of kinship and common culture (such as religious practice, customs, and language). Certain features of ethnicity were found to be dominant within late Second Temple Judaism generally, including the features of shared kinship, citizenship or connection to a land, and common culture in circumcision (defined by some as “religious practice”). Therefore, it seemed reasonable to question whether these particular features of ethnicity might be significant for the Qumran movement, and whether the *gēr* found within the scrolls might represent a convert who had made a change in these ethnic features, meaning that the individual’s conversion was made possible...
due to a notion of mutable ethnicity. The definitional problem was that even though converts were known to exist within late Second Temple Judaism, it was not clear which features of ethnicity were mutable in order to make it possible. Would every feature change? Or, would certain features remain immutable while others showed mutability in a conversion? In what way would a former Gentile no longer be a Gentile by means of conversion?

To answer the question regarding whether the term *gēr* of the Qumran movement is a convert, and furthermore whether the conversion takes place by means of mutable ethnicity, the answer in short is: yes. A comparison between the term *gēr* as it is employed in the DSS and scriptural predecessors has shown that the term has changed in meaning through scriptural rewriting in the DSS. While some would argue that the *gēr* of the DSS refers to a resident alien, nevertheless the present thesis concludes that the term *gēr* always refers to a Judean convert. Significant ethnic features within this convert’s identity are a notion of shared kinship, connection to a land, and a common culture in the practice of circumcision. The thesis has found traditions within the Qumran movement to react differently to this definition broadly defined. The Damascus (D) and Serek (S) traditions affiliated with the Qumran movement held different attitudes toward the mutability of these features, because the two traditions responded differently to the *gēr*. Where the D tradition is concerned, the *gēr* is a Gentile convert to Judaism who joined the movement affiliated with the D tradition. Where the S tradition is concerned, the *gēr* also represents a Gentile convert to Judaism, but the convert is excluded from the movement affiliated with S. The reason for this exclusion is because members of the S tradition believe that they have converted to an ethnicity which is beyond Judean (supra-Judean), by means of a secondary circumcision of the heart. This supra-Judean ethnicity is immutable to Gentile converts, for whom it is believed their Gentile nature was never relinquished. The following summary of chapter findings will explain further how the thesis arrived at these conclusions.
6.1 Summary of Chapter Findings

The introductory chapter’s review of contemporary scholarship on the gēr in the DSS found that scholarship has generally assumed that the Qumran movement would exclude Gentile converts to Judaism, or indeed anyone perceived as outsiders, due to the movement’s socially closed sectarian nature. Two primary traditions were affiliated with the Qumran movement: the tradition of D behind the Damascus Document rule was established to be somewhat more permeable than the tradition of S behind the Serek ha-Yahad, or Rule of the Community, although both have an overall sectarian nature. In light of the known conversions in Judea within the time frame of the writing of the scrolls, the nature of the gēr in the DSS demanded further inquiry. A review of gēr research within scriptural tradition more broadly confirmed that the term was seen to change in meaning over time from “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism,” and that consequently a comparison of the term in the DSS against majority scriptural predecessors could potentially reveal that the term held its new meaning within the DSS. The chapter also discussed the nature of ethnicity in late Second Temple Judaism, and scholarship’s views concerning which ethnic features might be construed as mutable and responsible for conversions. A critical question was whether the feature of kinship itself would also be involved in a conversion: Shaye Cohen argued against such a notion, and Philip Esler and Steve Mason argued in favour of the feature of kinship converting, along with all other features.¹

Chapter 2 provided the preliminary step of establishing the provenance and dating of the DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting in which the term gēr is employed. Assessment of literary devices, paleography, and orthography all came into service in an attempt to see whether each text could correlate first with the Qumran movement more generally, and second with either of the D or S traditions more specifically. The chapter determined that the

¹All of the scholarship reviewed in this chapter concerning ethnic identity, conversion, the meaning of the word gēr as it is employed within the DSS, and brotherhood within Greco-Roman associations, is a recapitulation of arguments offered in further detail within the Introductory chapter.
Qumran movement itself, while defined as a sectarian movement in the introductory chapter, cannot necessarily be identified with any known Judean group (for e.g., Zadokites or Essenes) with certainty. Therefore, the Qumran movement would simply be assessed based on its two primary traditions of D and S. Because frequently the manuscripts are very fragmentary, the reading of the word gēr was also verified, and confirmed, in every document.

The chapter discovered a number of correlations, which can be categorized in the following manner. First, 4QInstruction 4Q423 was established to precede the D and S traditions. Second, a number of texts correlated with the D tradition: CD itself (in the two occasions of CD VI, 14-VII, 1 and XIV, 3-6); Temple Scroll 11QT; 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B 4Q377; 4QOrdinances 4Q159; and 4QFour Lots 4Q279. Third, two texts correlated with the S tradition, namely 4QNahum Pesher 4Q169, and 4QFlorilegium 4Q174. And finally, three texts (4QText Mentioning Temple 4Q307; 4QHymnic or Sapiential Fragments 4Q498; and 4QNonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back 4Q520) correlated with the Qumran movement overall, but results establishing a clear relationship to either the D or S traditions specifically were indeterminate. Because correlations were observed in the divergent traditions of both D and S, one might hypothesize that more than one attitude concerning the gēr could be attested. The majority of scholars reviewed held the view that only one, uniform, attitude concerning the gēr would prevail across the entire Qumran movement, apart from three scholars who had suggested more than one attitude concerning the gēr: Katell Berthelot, who separated the gēr of 4Q169 and 4Q174 as “posing” converts, from an overall meaning of the gēr as a “stranger associated with Israel”; Terence Donaldson, who argued that the gēr of CD VI is actually a resident alien, versus every other gēr who is esteemed a convert welcomed into an idealized and hypothetical era; and Jutta Jokiranta, who noted the “errant” gēr of 4Q169, in opposition to every other gēr who is included as a full member in the movement. Even in these examples, the texts found to treat the gēr differently were considered anomalous.
Chapter 3 proceeded with a comparison between the occasions where the \textit{gēr} is employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS, and the majority scriptural predecessors (meaning scripture from the Masoretic tradition which became the majority canon). The chapter discovered that purposeful changes had been made, and the changes highlighted a different meaning for the \textit{gēr} from the majority scriptural meaning of “resident alien.” Even when the term \textit{gēr} in the scriptural rewriting was clearly borrowed from a scriptural predecessor, the \textit{gēr} was always understood by its subsequent meaning of a “convert,” and not an antiquarian meaning of “resident alien.” This finding contradicts an argument implied by Donaldson—that a recognizable reuse of the term \textit{gēr} might indicate the earlier meaning of “resident alien.” The interpretation for the \textit{gēr} as a convert also negates David Hamidović’s argument that the purpose of the rewriting is to consistently distance the cultural integration between the \textit{gēr} and the Israelite. In addition, the chapter discovered that even though the \textit{gēr} employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS always represented an individual with a Judean identity, differences in attitude toward the \textit{gēr} existed between the traditions of D and S. These differences affected the \textit{gēr}’s subsequent inclusion or exclusion.

In the texts correlated with the D tradition, the \textit{gēr} is always included and seems a full Judean member within the movement. For example, the \textit{gēr} in 4Q159 Frags. 2-4, 1-3 was found to share in Israelite kinship with other group members because of the manner in which the majority scriptural predecessor (Lev 25:47-55) was rewritten. Within the texts correlated with the S tradition (4Q169 and 4Q174), the \textit{gēr} appears to represent a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from the movement, because the S tradition does not consider Judean kinship to be mutable for Gentiles. In this regard, the present thesis finds affinity with the work of Berthelot, who noted that the \textit{gēr} of 4Q169 and 4Q174 might esteem himself a legitimate “convert,” and yet still be deemed illegitimate by the Qumran movement. This finding made sense in light of the S tradition’s more socially closed stance in relation to the D tradition.
Finally, the additional three texts that correlated with the Qumran movement overall also contribute to the discussion concerning the *gēr*’s identity: in each case, the *gēr* represents a Judean. In the examples of 4Q307 and 4Q520, the *gēr* is included within the movement as a Judean, because in the manuscript the *gēr* substitutes for Judean-born individuals or for Israel. In the case of 4Q498, the *gēr* is included within the milieu of a new land for a new people, promised on the condition of following certain commandments; this new milieu effaces the *gēr*’s prior meaning of resident alien and once again suggests a meaning of a Judean. The findings of this chapter also confirmed that attitudes toward mutable ethnic identity within Hellenism and late Second Temple Judaism, particularly as they relate to the features of kinship and land, clearly affected the Qumran movement.

Chapter 4 assessed to a greater extent the features of ethnic identity that are prevalent within the Qumran movement and how the features affect one another. First, the chapter collated the ways in which the *gēr* was observed to be included (or excluded) by means of the features of a shared notion of kinship, and also an inclusion in a connection to a land or the promise of land. The *gēr* showed signs of shared kinship in a number of ways, including representation as an Israelite “brother.” For example in 4Q159, “brother” language in the majority scriptural predecessor was manipulated so that the resultant *gēr* was no longer differentiated from the brother. The “brother” within the Qumran movement was established to represent either a Judean (in the tradition of D), or someone who is “more than Judean,” in other words, a “supra-Judean” (in the tradition of S). In the D tradition, the *gēr* representing a Judean (Israelite) brother would be accepted as a full member. Whereas, in the tradition of S, there the *gēr* representing a Gentile convert to Judaism was found to be excluded because his ethnicity was considered immutable, and the *gēr* could not attain supra-Judean status.

In a number of instances, the *gēr* was also found to share with Israelites in a connection to land, or the promise of return to land. Kinship perceptions furthermore influenced a *gēr*’s inclusion in the land. For example, 4Q377 promised a land of honey to be
given in the place of foreign nations, fashioned from the majority scriptural predecessor Exod 3:8, where a dichotomy is set up between Israelites and foreign nations. The *gēr* (established to share in Israelite kinship) would then be a part of the group that would replace the foreign nations in the land of honey.

Having established the prevalence and importance of the ethnic features of shared kinship and connection to a land within the Qumran movement by means of the study of the *gēr*, the chapter concluded with a study of the ethnic feature of common culture expressed in circumcision, as it is found within the D and S traditions. Because this feature was an important feature of conversions within late Second Temple Judaism more generally, a study of circumcision within the Qumran movement was deemed essential. The study also served as final proof that the inclusion of the *gēr* is representative of ethnic conversions. Even though no ritual of circumcision as a means of admission into the movement is mentioned within either of the rule texts of D or S, circumcision was found to play an important role in understanding the differences in the D and S traditions’ understanding of the *gēr*. The chapter concluded that in the tradition of D, mention of Abraham’s circumcision on the day of his knowing (CD XVI, 4-6), combined with an excerpt from Lev 12:3 requiring eighth day circumcision after birth (4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6), suggest that physical circumcision held cultural significance within this tradition. The chapter observed that where the tradition of S is concerned, 1QS V, 6 and a number of correlated texts refer to either a circumcision of form (*אשת, which is equated with a heart) or a circumcision of the heart. This circumcision of the heart is nowhere mentioned in the tradition of D, indicating that the circumcision of the heart is an understanding special to the S tradition. Because circumcision is a marker of conversion and Judean identity, the spiritual, metaphorical circumcision of the heart suggests that members of the S tradition have themselves undergone a kind of secondary conversion, corroborating the “supra-Judean” status of a member in the S tradition.

This supra-Judean status explains the exclusion of the *gēr* as a Gentile convert to Judaism in the S tradition. According to this tradition, Gentile converts are only “claiming”
Judeanness (per Berthelot), and thus these *gērīm* have never lost their Gentile ethnicity. Supra-Judean ethnicity, achieved through a circumcision of the heart, is not available to an individual esteemed a Gentile, because this individual had never gained a Judean identity in the first place.

Finally, while Chapters 2-4 provided a literary and textual means of investigating the *gēr*’s identity as a convert within the Qumran movement, Chapter 5 added a sociohistorical comparison to serve as final proof. The element of Qumran movement “brotherhood” was compared with “brother” language found in Greco-Roman associations. This chapter concluded that the language of brotherhood among group members can express a notion of shared kinship, if the group is primarily defined using the features of ethnicity (kinship and common culture, such as “religious practice” and language). Thus, Greco-Roman professional associations’ use of brother language only indicated sentiments of friendship and honour, as argued by Philip Harland. However, cultic associations’ use of brother language did represent shared kinship: in some cases, members of associations were defined by various titles of a nuclear family (such as father, sister, or brother) which represented the hierarchy within their newfound group kinship; in other cases, members seemingly took on the role of cosanguinal brothers through a formal association title of “Adopted Brothers.” This chapter demonstrated that kinship, in its social construction, is group specific, and explained the differences in kinship attitudes between the D and S traditions of the Qumran movement. It confirmed the conclusion from the literary and textual study of Chapters 2-4, namely that the *gēr*, described as a “brother,” shares in kinship and is indeed an ethnic convert.
6.2 Further Implications for Scholarship

A number of implications for scholarship may be drawn from the present thesis. The present study provides the first full assessment of the gēr within scriptural rewriting in the DSS. A close study of the gēr has yielded pertinent findings for scholarship’s understanding of the Qumran movement. The word is definitely an indicator of perceptions toward mutable ethnicity and conversion in the late Second Temple period within this sectarian movement, and its study has shed light on other Mediterranean groups in this time period, including Second Temple Judaism more generally and also Greco-Roman associations, via the gēr’s description as a brother. Furthermore, this study of the gēr’s identity has also led to an understanding of the identity of Qumran movement members more generally. Because the gēr’s ethnic identity has changed to correspond with the identity of the D or S traditions, consequently the features of shared kinship, connection to a land, and common culture that were integral features within the gēr’s conversion are also critical features of the ethnic identity of all members.

Second, whether a text is future oriented or not does not impact the outcome of inclusion or exclusion toward the gēr. For example, the gēr was found to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, who was included within the Qumran movement affiliated with D, in scrolls that clearly represented a “contemporary” era to the movement, such as 11QTa and 4Q159. The gēr was equally found to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism within the Qumran movement affiliated with D, in 4Q279, which did contain a messianic understanding for distribution of lots. However, the gēr was excluded from the future eschatological temple described in 4Q174, a text correlating with the tradition of S. A convert can truly exist within the on-the-ground contemporary era of the Qumran movement as an included member within the tradition of D, negating the view of some scholars that the gēr would be only an included or excluded reality within a hypothetical or eschatological time (per Donaldson and Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, respectively).
Third, the thesis confirms that even though the gēr is always a “convert,” there is more than one uniform perception toward the convert-gēr of the DSS. Chapter 2’s study of the D and S provenance of the texts that employ the gēr proved to be vital to understanding the split in attitudes toward the gēr; different views toward the gēr exist between the D and S traditions, because their views toward kinship are different. This finding corroborates scholarship that considers D and S to be two different traditions within the Qumran movement, whereby both are sectarian, but D is less socially closed than S. In addition, the finding that the S tradition considers members to be of supra-Judean ethnicity because of a secondary circumcision of the heart, explains and clarifies the reason for that tradition’s added social closure. The sociohistorical comparison in Chapter 5 furthermore highlighted and confirmed that the nature of kinship is very group specific.

Fourth, the ethnic feature of kinship can show mutability in the process of conversion. In fact, in the D tradition, the mutability of the ethnic feature of kinship is critical. Shaye Cohen made the astute observation regarding the trio of important ethnic features within late Second Temple Judaism (kinship; citizenship and connection to land; and common culture), but the present thesis has disproven his conclusion that kinship is always immutable as a part of Judean conversions within Hellenistic Judaism. Steve Mason and Philip Esler were correct in their observation that in a conversion, all the features of an individual’s ethnic identity will convert together. However, while kinship may not be the “prime test” of ethnicity (which was Esler’s critique contra Cohen), it is certainly a dominant feature where the Qumran movement is concerned.

Fifth, the identity of the Qumran movement is closer in alignment with the mutable ethnicity of Hellenism, late Second Temple Judaism, and the ancient Mediterranean, rather than the Persian era of postexilic Judaism. For example, to argue that the gēr would only be associated with Israel for “religious” matters, as does Berthelot, implies an understanding of the gēr within the earlier context of the Holiness Legislation (HL), whereby the gēr is still a
resident alien, yet must follow the ordinances and statues as must Israelites for the sake of the land’s holiness (Lev 18:26-28). Hamidović’s argument that converts are only relevant outside of Israel, where the sanctity of the land is of little concern, is also more fitting to the early postexilic period and the priestly HL legislation to keep the land holy, than late Second Temple Judaism. The present thesis has demonstrated that matters of conversion and ethnicity are important for the identity of the Qumran movement, in spite of its location in Judea. A comparison to early (Persian) Second Temple period Judaism is outmoded.

Sixth, the language of brotherhood is a significant indicator itself to uncovering newfound notions of shared kinship among members who join groups that are defined primarily by ethnic features, across the spectrum of the ancient Mediterranean. The term “brother” signifies newfound notions of kinship in Greco-Roman cultic associations, and not merely the sentiment of friendship and responsibility between members. This is an additional contribution to scholarship, above and beyond the findings of the gēr as a Judean convert and a brother. Furthermore, the study confirms prior scholarship that “brother” language need not show equality, and in fact, when used within ethnic groups, usually highlights levels of hierarchy between members (e.g., the gēr listed last among the classes of “brothers” listed in CD XIV, or the “brother” of Greco-Roman cultic associations when contrasted against members identified as “fathers”).

Seventh, the hypothesis that a comparison of the gēr as it is employed within the DSS against predecessors of majority scripture would signal sociohistorical changes in the meaning of the term, as it did in early scriptural traditions, proved sound. The present study confirms the work of prior scholars who have used such a technique, and encourages a continued use of the method into the future. Intriguingly, the technique of rewriting for the purpose of changing ethnicities extends beyond Judean texts and exists within Hellenic genealogies as well. Jonathan Hall’s comment that “relationships within genealogies are
modified through the addition, omission, and substitution of certain names”² mirrors the present study’s application of scriptural rewriting as evidenced in additions, conflations, omissions, or substitutions.

Certain limitations in analyzing the gēr within the DSS must also be recognized. First, one notes an absence of women in this work presenting the gēr as a male Gentile convert to Judaism. Clearly women were members of the D tradition; how would, and could, a Gentile woman convert and subsequently join the D tradition since male circumcision was not an option for her? Would a Gentile woman have been absorbed through marriage to a Judean member of the D tradition, or would she be converted through simply adopting other Judean practices of common culture, or, is it possible the D tradition did not think women could “convert”?³ A second limitation of the present study is that even though scriptural rewriting reveals sociohistorical changes, there are limits to analyzing fragmentary texts. Sometimes, it is difficult to discern whether the presumed scriptural predecessors can actually be attributed to the work of the ancient scribe, or whether they are a product of the modern scholar’s own bricolage and act of rewriting.

²Hall, *Hellenicity*, 27.
³For overviews of these notions elsewhere within late Second Temple and beyond, see, for example, Judith M. Lieu, “Circumcision, Women and Salvation,” *NTS* 40, no. 3 (1994): 358–70; Schwartz, “Doing Like Jews or Becoming a Jew?”.
6.3 Proposals for Further Research

Numerous additional avenues for research arise from the findings of this thesis. First, having studied scriptural rewriting in the DSS that employ the gēr, it would now be pertinent to study the gēr as it is employed within other late Second Temple period texts, such as Jubilees, Ben Sira, and Tobit. Does the gēr (or prosēlutos) in these texts also mean a convert, and furthermore, can the analysis of the gēr also reveal the mutability or immutability of ethnic features behind the groups that composed or used these texts, just as it did within the Qumran movement?

Second, the thesis addresses the ethnic feature of common culture in the practice of circumcision within the Qumran movement. The theme of circumcision of the heart arises in texts correlated with the S tradition of the Qumran movement. More analysis can be undertaken concerning this theme, which arises across the literature of early Judean groups or literature influenced by Judean groups (e.g. Jub. 1:23; Rom 2:29; Odes Sol. 11:1-3).

Third, it was discovered that for the S tradition of the Qumran movement, the conversion of the gēr as a Gentile convert to Judaism is considered illegitimate because the S tradition does not believe that Judean kinship is mutable for Gentiles. Christine Hayes argues that this immutability (or “genealogical impurity”) is due to the fact that “Qumranites” (the present thesis would argue the S tradition only) belong to a school of thought whereby the belief is held that a Gentile’s seed will always remain profane. Hayes argues furthermore that within this belief, in contrast to a Gentile’s profane seed, a Judean’s seed is holy, because the seed is priestly. A subsequent question which arises from this argument is how the D and S traditions might see themselves as priestly or not, considering their differences in attitude toward kinship mutability.4 Is it possible that members of the S tradition would equate their supra-Judean nature with a priestly nature?

---

4Hayes, Gentile Impurities, 73–75.
Fourth, more research can be done on the subject of mutable ethnicity and the notion of “brotherhood” across early “congregations.” For example, Daniel Boyarin argues that Paul works within a dualist ideology according to which there is both a spiritual and a physical body, and the spiritual body enables one to escape the physical body and ethnicity.⁵ One might pursue the idea that instead of an escape from ethnicity, Paul’s “brothers” may have converted to a spiritual ethnicity, seeing that an individual can maintain multiple ethnicities, as Philip Esler argues.⁶

In sum, the study of the gēr in the DSS proved to highlight the complexity of the dynamics of conversion and mutable ethnicity within the Qumran movement and beyond. Communities have been discovered to be far more mutable than they were thought to be at first glance, and kinship was observed to contain individual variations in each group where this feature of ethnicity was found. Scholarship’s fascination with the gēr can, and should, yield many exciting findings to come.

---

⁶Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 73.
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